

III

A Press and a Culture

Throughout the late nineteenth century, German-American radicalism was at times almost synonymous with the American left. And nowhere were the Germans more clearly important than in the radical press. In the upsurge of immigrant working-class activism that culminated with the Chicago Haymarket riot, German-language socialist and anarchist newspapers stood out prominently. Furthermore, during the suppression of a multilingual radical movement in the aftermath of Haymarket, authorities targeted editors of the German papers for special attention and retaliation. The Chicago police, perhaps even more than working-class activists, equated the radical movement with the radical press.

The prominence of the German-American radical community often led to an insular mentality. The German-speaking left developed its own clubs, benefit associations, singing societies, and athletic organizations. Perhaps the best means for recapturing the totality of this radical subculture is through the annual calendars, published by many of the German-American radical papers. In addition to providing a sampling of the latest political arguments, the calendars offered everything from recent fiction to hints for decorating. But their most important function was to provide a sense of community to German-American radicals, a sense of shared purpose and shared culture. This annual publishing event was the means through which the left educated its rank and file by offering its adherents a fully developed alternative to mainstream American life.

The insularity of the German-American radical subculture had serious implications for women. In a much more concerted way than

III. A Press and a Culture

American-born socialists, German immigrant leftists clung to a domestic ideal that left women's issues out of the mainstream of radical concerns. The debates raging in the women's pages, which began to appear in the German-language socialist newspapers after the turn of the century, testified to the difficulties that German-American women had in building bridges to the American women's rights movement. In the German-American radical press, male editors ensured that the correct political line privileged class over gender. Ironically, then, a press which offered such a vibrant political alternative to the dominant American culture could not assimilate one of the potentially most progressive parts of that culture.

Bruce C. Nelson

Arbeiterpresse und Arbeiterbewegung: Chicago's Socialist and Anarchist Press, 1870–1900

In April 1880 *Der Vorbote*, an official organ of the Socialist Labor party in Chicago, asserted "Die Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung in den Vereinigten Staaten ist zugleich die Geschichte der Arbeiterpresse" (The history of the workers' movement in the United States is at the same time the history of the workers' press). That insight is important, for what we know of Chicago's socialist and anarchist movements has come largely from the *Socialist* and the *Alarm*, two of the movement's English-language papers. But between 1870 and 1900 Chicago's socialists and anarchists issued fifty-two newspapers, published in eight different languages: fourteen of them German, eleven Czech, nine English, eight Scandinavian, six Polish, three Lithuanian, and one Italian. Fewer than half of those titles have been preserved, but their publishing histories were crucial to the movement's development, their formats chronicle its organization, their circulation histories reveal the growth of a sympathetic following, and their contents reflect the movement's alienation and radicalization.¹

Socialism in Chicago dates from 1853 when H. Roesch and J. Karlen briefly issued *Der Proletarier*, the city's first German socialist paper; in 1860 Joseph Weydemeyer and Julius Standau offered the *Stimme des Volkes* to one thousand subscribers for almost eight months. By the end of the Civil War, the city was home to a section of the International Workingmen's Association (IWA, the First International) which included German, Czech, Polish, Norwegian, and Danish branches. The IWA helped form the Workingmen's party of Illinois in 1874; two years later the WPI joined with several other organizations to found the Workingmen's party of the United States. In December 1877 the WPUS

changed its name to the Socialist Labor party, which over the next four years captured 20 percent of the 1879 mayoral vote and elected one state senator, three state representatives, and five aldermen. In 1880, Chicago's CASLP split into two factions. One remained loyal to the party and committed to electoral socialism; the radical faction embraced armed revolution and founded the Revolutionary Socialist party (RSP) in 1881. Those radicals joined the International Working People's Association (IWPA) in 1883, and Chicago became the center of the American anarchist movement.²

Many of those who had been socialists in the 1870s became anarchists in the 1880s; after Haymarket most became socialists again. The frequency with which the movement changed its name obscures four essential continuities: of organization, of a cadre unconcerned with labels, of members who followed those leaders, and of ideological evolution. Beneath those changing labels lay a process of radicalization and a socialist movement. Beyond what the press reveals of that movement, it illuminates as well something of the city's working class and the processes of class formation. Those processes exploded in the Haymarket Square riot; they are chronicled in the city's socialist and anarchist press; and the best way to grasp that movement is to examine its public face.

The Emergence of a Multilingual Radical Press

The size and growth of Chicago's socialist movement can be seen from its polyglot press. In 1870 the left offered a socialist critique in at least three languages: *Narodni noviny* [National Gazette], a weekly edited by Lev Palda and J. B. Belohradsky, served the city's Czechs; *Der Deutsche Arbeiter*, a weekly edited by Carl Klings and published by the German Workers' Protective and Support Society; and *Dagslyset* [Daylight], a monthly edited by Marcus Thrane, aimed at the Dano-Norwegian community. From 1870 to 1886 Chicago's socialists and anarchists published twenty-two newspapers: eleven in German, five in Danish or Norwegian, four in Czech, and two in English; five were dailies, eleven weeklies, and two monthlies.

The most durable of these papers were published in German by the Socialist Publishing Society (SPS). *Der Vorbote*, the oldest, was founded in 1874 as a weekly, and the society grew out of the Verein Vorboten. In June 1876 the SPS confidently issued a second paper, *Die Volks-Zeitung*, as a tri-weekly. It expanded local news, leaving *Der Vorbote* with a weekly summary and larger audience. In May 1878 *Die Fackel* appeared as a Sunday weekly; one year later, as the SLP

continued to grow in members and the SPS in confidence, the tri-weekly *Volks-Zeitung* became the daily *Arbeiter-Zeitung*.³ Between 1874 and 1886, at least ten editors were hired and fired by the society: Carl Klings, Josef Gruenhut, Jakob Winnen, Conrad Conzett, Paul Grottkau, Gustav Lyser, Wilhelm Rosenberg, Edward Liebig, August Spies, and Michael Schwab. All were immigrants, all but Swiss-born Conzett and Bohemian-born Gruenhut were German, all but Liebig and Grottkau came from working-class families; seven of the ten held elected union office, and half had been journalists before emigration. Based on his study of German workers, labor leaders, and the labor movement in Chicago, Hartmut Keil has concluded that "listing the editors of *Vorbote*, *Chicagoer Arbeiter-Zeitung*, and *Fackel* is almost equivalent to enumerating Chicago's outstanding German labor leaders of the period." These men, like those Antonio Gramsci later labeled "organic intellectuals," used the papers as pulpits and forums.⁴ By the time of the Haymarket Affair, the SPS issued three papers, a daily and two weeklies, and published seven days a week.

The German monopoly over Chicago's socialist press continued through the 1877 Great Upheaval. That fall Louis Pio, the founder of the Danish socialist movement, called for a national organization of Scandinavian workers in America, and announced a new paper, *Den Nye Tid* [The New Age], to be published in Dano-Norwegian. Pio was joined by Marcus Thrane, another exiled 48er, the father of the Norwegian labor movement. Even in exile, Pio and Thrane were perhaps the two most famous Scandinavian socialists of the nineteenth century. Yet Pio's comrades ousted him, in May 1878, when they found him simultaneously working on a Methodist paper. A freethinker, Thrane proved more acceptable, and the paper "adopted a strongly anti-clerical and atheistic stance" as it became an official SLP organ. In fall 1880 he too was ousted by a group of insurgents led by Peter Petersen and Olaf Ray. In October 1881 the RSP named *Den Nye Tid* an official organ; two years later it became one of the IWPA's organs. Combining socialism and rationalism, it survived through April 1884, perhaps even longer.⁵

An English organ, the *Socialist*, appeared in September 1878, six months after *Den Nye Tid*'s birth. When Cincinnati's *National Socialist* went under, the Chicago section bought its subscription list, paid off its debts, hired Frank Hirth, a German-born cigarmaker, and moved the paper to Chicago. Renamed the *Socialist*, its announced goal was to organize workers "into one grand political labor party for the purpose of securing labor's rights." Despite a circulation of 4,500, Hirth got fired about a month before the paper died in August 1879 and Albert

Parsons briefly assumed the editorship. With its death came grumblings about the loss of "German money" and the defection of the Irish from the SLP; in its wake Chicago's English-speaking socialists were without a paper for five years.⁶

Five other papers—three Czech, one English, and one German—appeared after the schism with the SLP and were anarchist papers. The Czech-language *Budoucnost* [The Future] appeared in June 1883, first as an eight-page biweekly, then as a weekly, issued from a small printing shop in the heart of the Bohemian colony. A contemporary account described it as "a very small sheet . . . , having only a limited number of subscribers," and suggested that its articles were largely "translations from the German daily, the *Arbeiter-Zeitung*." Composed of recent immigrants exiled by the Austrian antisocialist laws, its editorial collective all worked outside the paper. Josef Pondelicek was a painter (and president of Chicago's first Bohemian painters' union); Jakub Mikolanda, a carpenter and officer in the carpenters' union; and Norbert Zoula a silversmith; only Josef Boleslav Pecka—cofounder of Czech social democracy—had any experience as a journalist.⁷

In October 1884, the *Alarm: A Socialist Weekly* was founded to serve Chicago's English-speaking radicals. The *Alarm* rejected electoral politics as it embraced armed revolution. Albert and Lucy Parsons shared editorial responsibilities with Lizzie May Swank, a native-born dressmaker active in the Working Women's Union. Although it was "owned and controlled by the IWPA," Parsons exercised little editorial control: "I had no right to shut off anybody's complaint. The *Alarm* was a labor paper, and it was specifically published for the purpose of allowing every human being who wore the chains of monopoly to clank those chains in the columns of the *Alarm*. It was a free press organ. It was a free speech newspaper." The *Alarm* appeared as a weekly for three months, then found "our expenses being too heavy [and] the prospects . . . gloomy" and reluctantly became a fortnightly. It was never solvent: the Alarm Publishing Association frequently scheduled picnics, dances, and festivals to keep it afloat.⁸

Chicago's last three anarchist papers had much shorter histories, and we know little about any of them. *Svoboda* [Freedom], an "anarchist journal" appeared in November 1883 and is mentioned in Max Nettlau's anarchist bibliography. *Lampcka* [The Lantern], a Czech weekly, was published from August 1885 through April 1886. The same day the police suppressed *Budoucnost*, they raided and closed *Lampcka's* basement office. After describing it as "a Bohemian Anarchistic paper," the *Chicago Tribune* reported "the proprietor and editor . . . bears the name of Hradecny" and that he had fled the city after the riot.⁹ In December

1885, one of the IWPA's twenty-six Chicago groups complained that the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* was "not radical enough." Led by Adolph Fischer, a compositor, and George Engel, a painter turned shopkeeper (both executed on November 11, 1887), Gruppe Nordwestseite began its own four-page monthly, *Der Anarchist*, in January 1886. Proclaiming itself an "Organ der Autonomen Gruppen der I.A.A. [International Arbeiter Association, the German translation for IWPA]," it reportedly followed the violent editorial line of Johann Most's *Die Freiheit*, but in its short life was never recognized as an official IWPA organ. Only four or five issues appeared before its editorial collective was arrested and the paper suppressed in the wake of the riot. The *Anarchist* may explain two competing Bohemian anarchist papers: if *Lampcka* was an anarchist paper it was probably more radical than *Budoucnost*.¹⁰

In 1886 then, Chicago's anarchists issued six or seven papers, five of them official organs of the International Working People's Association, published in three languages. *Der Vorbote*, *Die Fackel*, *Die Chicagoer Arbeiter-Zeitung*, and *Der Anarchist* appeared in German; *Budoucnost* and *Lampcka* in Czech; and the *Alarm* in English.

Contents

These papers shared editorial material but specialized by language. *Den Nye Tid* claimed to be "the only Danish-Norwegian Workers' newspaper and organ for the Scandinavian socialists in the United States"; judging from its first issue *Budoucnost* concentrated on Bohemian activities. While the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* occasionally reported meetings of the American group, the *Alarm* never covered any of the other ethnic groups within the movement. The SPS's papers were printed with fraktur type, few commercial advertisements, and infrequent illustrations. The daily had four pages, the Saturday political weekly eight, and the Sunday cultural issue twelve. The first page offered national and international telegraphic dispatches, the second carried editorials, the third page serialized a novel and carried advertising, and the last page held local, movement, and trade-union news. Every issue published directories, announcements, and reports of Chicago's labor and social-revolutionary movements. The daily concentrated on the local movement, *Der Vorbote* offered a weekly review but aimed beyond the city limits, and after 1881 *Die Fackel* offered a "Kleine Frauen-Zeitung" to women.

The WPUS's Union Congress had proposed that the socialist press "represent the interests of labor, awaken and arouse the class feeling amongst the workingmen, promote their organization as well as

the trade-union movement and spread economical [sic] knowledge among them." All of Chicago's anarchist papers subscribed to *Den Nye Tid's* credo:

Its purpose is to safeguard and promote the interests of the worker and to spread socialist teaching among our countrymen. It will work to gather all workers in one association to establish a social order which will grant the worker his rights. It will oppose corruption, rottenness, exploitation and capitalist domination. It will fight against monopoly and the predatory nature of the system and will aim at liberating work from the yoke of capitalism. It will contain editorials on social, political and economic matters. It will bring news about the workers and workers' movement in all continents. . . . It will not be written in a haughty or pompous language, but in a style understood by the common man.

The *Arbeiter-Zeitung* applauded the *Vorbote* as "really the only socialist paper in America which under all circumstances will preach true and consistent class-hatred." The socialists reveled in baiting the bourgeois press; an infrequent cartoon showed a dog, variously labeled "Freie Presse" or "Staats-Ztg" baying at a moon labeled "Arb. Ztg."; and their editors provoked at least three libel suits. Under the header "Stadtrath," the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* carefully recorded the proceedings—and the machinations—of the city council and the boodle gang. The *Alarm's* articles, as Paul Le Blanc noted, "ranged from the impudent, to the imprudent, to the totally outrageous" as Parsons and Swank filled its pages with lively social commentary; reports on strikes, union meetings, and demonstrations; editorial opinion and educational articles on revolutionary theory; extensive correspondence from its readers; and reprints from other socialist journals.¹¹

Perhaps *Die Fackel*—whose masthead featured the torch of liberty and its own name engulfed in the flames of revolution—best expressed the movement's "feverishly combative character." The Sunday edition took as its slogan "Giving the serious and the funny its due, and despising nothing but the base." It published socialist poetry, songs, and plays; each issue serialized a novel (including ones by Émile Zola, Eugène Sue, George Sand, and Louise Michel); a regular column reviewed the city's theater. Its "Skizzen aus dem Leben der Großstadt," another regular column, reported fads and fashions, rumors and street conversation. In the remarkable hands of Gustav Lyser, a poet and playwright, the *Fackel* reveled in "the spirit of rebellion 'against everything,' against bourgeois culture and morality, conservative trade unionism, and above all, against the state." Lyser, and those who succeeded him, could be irreverent, satirical, witty, and sarcastic.¹²

These papers molded and then chronicled the evolution of their editors' and readers' ideology. *Der Vorbote*, *Die Arbeiter-Zeitung*, and *Die Fackel* began as the political organs of workingmen's parties, became socialist papers, and then broke with parliamentary socialism to become anarchist organs. The *Vorbote's* changing subtitles record that process. In 1874 it proclaimed "Organ der Arbeiterpartei für Stadt und Land"; then in 1876 became "Organ und Eigenthum der Arbeiter-Partei der Vereinigten Staaten." In 1878 it described itself as an "Unabhängiges Organ für die wahren Interessen des Proletariats"; and from 1880 through 1919 it remained the "Wochenausgabe der *Chicagoer Arbeiter-Zeitung*." Those changes reflect an evolution from artisan republicanism (note "Stadt und Land") to socialism, as does the name change from the *Volks-Zeitung* to the *Arbeiter-Zeitung*. Chicago's anarchist papers are most famous for their revolutionary rhetoric, for preaching class war, and for their fascination with the cult of dynamite. The *Vorbote* had presented the Lehr- und Wehr-Verein, a paramilitary organization, as "the workingman's answer to the servile militia" of the bourgeoisie. Lucy Parsons's broadside, "An Address to Tramps" advised, "Learn the Use of Explosives!" The *Alarm* published articles on "Assassination" and "Street-fighting—How to Meet the Enemy." The *Arbeiter-Zeitung* advertised Johann Most's pamphlet *Revolutionäre Kriegswissenschaft*—a handbook on dynamite, nitroglycerin, guncotton, and poisons—and offered its readers free instruction in the handling of arms. The *Anarchist* reveled in the fearsome image of the wild-eyed bomb-thrower, indeed it cultivated that persona. This was "bomb-talking," as Floyd Dell perceptively called it and, "it was done partly to attract attention . . . a way of shocking the public into attention. So desperate a means of securing an audience [was] certainly a sign of weakness."¹³

Beyond both rhetoric and image, Chicago's socialist and anarchist press addressed five different but overlapping audiences. The first was an immigrant audience, new to Chicago and America. The first page of the SPS's papers remained devoted to news from home, arranged by the subdivisions of the homeland: news from Berlin, from Nassau, from Hesse. Such telegraphic dispatches served an obvious purpose for the uprooted, but they also included reports from Europe: Scandinavia, France, Switzerland, Spain, and Russia. The German papers published daily market reports for foodstuffs (bread, meat, potatoes, sugar, coffee) to advise recent arrivals; they also published railroad timetables for immigrants, streetcar schedules to aid visitors, and the locations of fire department call boxes. In so doing they differed little from their bourgeois competitors, the Republican *Illinois Staats-Zeitung*

and the Democratic *Freie Presse*. Moreover, both socialist and bourgeois papers featured the omnipresent steamship ads and those from the railroad companies for cheap western land.

These papers aimed more specifically at a second audience of workers, featuring, for example, the saloons which figured so prominently in working-class culture. Most advertisements—for food, clothing, doctors, housing, home furnishings, and entertainment—stressed their affordability and serviceability, not their fashion or extravagance. Parsons and Swank devoted much of their paper to readers' letters; the German papers and *Budoucnost* reported on proletarian fraternal and gymnastic societies, including the German Turnvereine and the Czech sokols; both Germans and Czechs published streetcar schedules and market prices; and they announced births, marriages, and deaths. If the English and Scandinavian papers addressed far-flung radicals, the German and Czech ones served concentrated and local communities.

Third, Chicago's socialist and anarchist press served several of the city's trade unions and these papers remain our best source on their activities. The German furniture and metal workers and the German typographical union had been the *Vorbote's* founding supporters and all used it as their official organ. In March 1879, as the SLP was about to earn its greatest electoral success, the *Socialist* complained that only a handful of the city's trade unions were organized "on a socialistic basis." In 1884 the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* became the official organ of the new IWPA-dominated Central Labor Union (CLU), which could claim the membership of the city's eleven largest unions. Despite that affiliation, the socialist press announced the meetings of all three of the city's labor organizations: the conservative Trades and Labor Assembly, the reformist Knights of Labor, and the anarchist CLU. In the months before Haymarket, the membership rolls of all three rivals would grow meteorically.¹⁴

Fourth, these papers spoke to and for the party's membership. The German socialist party, SPD, earned considerable news space and long articles—like the *Fackel's* "Sozialistische Katechismus," which was later translated in the *Alarm*—explained socialist economics and anarchist politics to the reader. Lists of socialist books at reduced prices ran regularly. The fourth page of each paper offered a bulletin board which announced party meetings, reporting place and time, and identifying the lecturer and subject. Beneath those announcements lay a short account, a précis of the lecture and discussion, the election of officers, and the announcement of new members, a chance for the movement to publicize its growth and development. Some advertisers specifically addressed party members as they offered club regalia and discounts.

The German papers recorded the marriages, births, and deaths of party members and their families.

Finally, Chicago's socialist and anarchist press also cultivated an audience once described by Albert Parsons as the movement's "sympathetic following." In August 1877 the *Vorbote* asserted "Die Arbeiter-Bewegung [ist] eine Kultur-Bewegung," and these papers chronicle the cultivation of a movement culture—encompassing singing societies, theater groups, dances, festivals, picnics, parades, and the annual celebration of the Paris Commune—which recruited new members and invigorated the activists. The *Arbeiter-Zeitung* announced one event this way: "The Southside Group celebrates . . . its foundation festival. The program includes speeches and song. The comrades . . . are a jolly crowd and there we may expect a very enjoyable evening." A week later the same paper reviewed "a pleasant meeting combined with dancing. The main points were serious and humorous lectures and plays. The Socialistic Sängerbund did its full share. It seems that there exists no more fun and enjoyment anywhere than among the socialists as they only separated in the best of spirits early in the morning."¹⁵ Movement culture served Chicago's socialists and anarchists from secular baptisms through rationalist funerals. These newspapers sought to explain that culture and to make it attractive to a sympathetic following.

The radical press tried to address five different but overlapping audiences: of immigrants, workers, trade unionists, party members, and sympathizers. These papers had staked out a field alien to the English-language press, below that of the bourgeois press, and far to the left of the commercial press. Gilded Age socialists and anarchists assumed that the fundamental tasks for its press were those of education, agitation, and organization. They embraced class differences as the only alternative to assimilation and they saw conflict as inevitable. And they were beginning to work out the dialectic of class and ethnicity. The radical press mobilized and educated the movement's active membership as it recruited and politicized a sympathetic following.

Publication and Circulation

Each of these papers was issued by a publishing society: all were cooperative ventures, which meant that only subscribers could buy stock (and few expected any dividends), that the staffs had to respond to the readership, and that editors were responsible to a board of directors. Comprising editors, reporters, compositors, and carriers, those boards tried to blur the traditional distinctions between man-

agement and labor. Composed of party members, societies hired and fired editors, and exercised some editorial direction, but their main role remained fund-raising. We know the most about the Socialist Publishing Society (SPS) which was the oldest and became the prototype for the others. It defined its mission as the "education and intellectual improvement of its members through the fostering of moral culture, history, political economy, statistics, philosophy and other subjects, by means of regular meetings, debates, lectures and addresses, pamphlets, newspapers, periodicals and publications."¹⁶

At the end of 1883 *Der Vorbote* reported that 15,729 books and pamphlets had been distributed by the Chicago groups. Two years later the *Alarm* published a more comprehensive report. During the preceding ten months, 387,537 books, pamphlets, and circulars had been distributed by Chicago's publishing societies: "The number of books and brochures sold was 6,527. (They were mostly valuable books, viz.: Marx, Lassalle, Bebel, Hyndman, Bakunine, Reclus [*sic*], Gronlund, etc.) From the brochures of Comrade John Most there were circulated 5,000; Address to Tramps, by Mrs. Parsons, 10,000; 'How to Put Down the Commune,' 5,000; Communistic Manifesto, 25,000; Pittsburgh Proclamation, in English, German, French and Bohemian, 200,000; gratis copies of the *Alarm* were circulated 96,000."¹⁷ But such productivity stretched the movement's resources. In 1876 *Der Vorbote* reported a weekly income of \$108, expenses of \$106.75, and a profit of \$1.25; when the *Socialist* died three years later, it had a weekly income of \$45 and expenses of \$87. Each week threatened to be a socialist paper's last. The SPS kept publishing because it had conceded a union shop to (German) Typographia No. 9 which in turn subsidized the socialist press by working below scale. The bourgeois German papers resented that practice, as did the English printers' union which recognized that "the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* is a socialistic sheet and the members of the [International Typographical Union] are not permitted to work in its office."¹⁸

The SPS did not own a printing press until after Haymarket; instead its compositors set the type, then delivered the forms to a job printer for the press run. On the other hand, it occupied a three-story building, with a restaurant on the first floor, editorial and composing departments for the German papers and the *Alarm* on the second, meeting rooms and the IWPA's central library on the third. In contrast, both the Scandinavians and Bohemians owned their presses, although hardly comparable offices. *Lampcka* and *Budoucnost* issued from basements, and *Den Nye Tid* came out of another "hole"—"an unimpressive wooden building." According to one of its printers, "Daylight came

from windows in the roof and at night there was an oil lamp. . . . All the book printing was done on a monster job press that was operated by foot power. We had great trouble getting anyone to feed and tread that press."¹⁹

Compared to its editors, staff, and compositors, Chicago's socialist and anarchist readership has remained largely invisible. What little information we can recover supports three conclusions. First, the German papers clearly dominated circulation, accounting for 80 percent of the total; while the Scandinavian, Czech, and English papers split the remainder. Second, the bulk of that circulation was by subscription and delivered by local news carriers. The German papers and *Budoucnost* had an elaborate distribution network that included carriers, news dealers, and the postal system; in contrast, the *Alarm* depended on single-issue purchases handled by news dealers. Third, and to reverse Richard Ely's insight, their "respectable circulation" carried with it "advertising patronage."²⁰

The circulation histories of Chicago's radical papers measure the movement's growth. (See table 1.) The SLP's four papers had enjoyed a total circulation of 14,600 in 1880; the IWPA's seven papers enjoyed a total of 30,780 in 1886, an increase of 111 percent. Those 30,000 readers represented less than 4 percent of the city's population, but about 12 percent of its wage earners. Not only did circulation grow faster than the city's population but this discussion may underestimate readership, for it presumes that circulation equaled readership, that a paper was read by only one person. The *Alarm* asked, "Please pass this paper to a friend," and anarchist saloons became important distributors. According to the police, the city's "saloonkeepers always looked to it, the first thing in the morning, that plenty of anarchist literature and a dozen or so copies of the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* were duly on the tables of their places, and in some saloons beer-bloated bums, who could manage to read fairly [well], were engaged to read aloud such articles as were particularly calculated to stir up the passions of the benighted patrons."²¹

Subscription was a conscious decision, for anarchist papers did not entice their readers. Nor was the anarchist press the only ethnic press in Chicago: on the contrary, each paper had to compete with bourgeois foreign-language papers, some long and firmly established. Thus the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* competed with four other German dailies; the *Vorbote* and the *Fackel* competed with at least ten other German weeklies. The *Nye Tid* was up against five commercial Scandinavian papers, both dailies and weeklies; *Budoucnost* and *Lampcka* shared the Czech market with at least two other weeklies.²²

Table 1
The Roster and Circulations of Chicago's Socialist and Anarchist Press, 1870-1886

Paper	First Issue	Last Issue	Language	Frequency	1872	1874	1876	1878	1880	1882	1884	1886
Narodni noviny	1868	1871	Cz									
Deutsche Arbeiter	1869	1870	G	d								
Dagslyset	1869	1878	N	m	400			260				
Arbeiterfreund	1874	1874	G	w								
Vorbote	1874	1924	G	w		700	3,050	3,000	5,000	6,500	7,115	8,000
Ch. Sozialist	1876	1879	G	d								
Arbeiter-Zeitung	1876	1919	G	d					3,000	4,850	5,326	5,780
Volks-Zeitung	1877	1877	G	d								
Arbeideren	1877	1877	N	w								
Ch. Volks-Zeitung	1877	1879	G	d								
Neue Zeit	1877	1879	G	w				1,500				
Fackel	1877	1919	G	w					5,000	7,150	10,000	12,200
Den Nye Tid	1878	1884	D-N	w				600	1,600	2,000	2,800	
Den Nye Verden	1878	1878	D	w								
Socialist	1878	1879	E	w				3,000				

Paper	First Issue	Last Issue	Lan- guage	Fre- quency	1872	1874	1876	1878	1880	1882	1884	1886
Tilskueren	1878	1882	D						800			
Svoboda	1883	1883	Cz								500	750
Budoucnost	1883	1886	Cz	w							2,000	
Ill. Volks-zeitung	1884	1884	G	w							2,000	
Alarm	1884	1886	E	w								3,000
Lampcka	1885	1886	Cz	w								750
Anarchist	1886	1886	G	m								300
Totals					400	700	3,050	8,360	15,400	20,500	29,741	30,780
Number change						+300	2,350	5,310	7,040	5,100	9,241	1,039
Percent change						+75	+336	+174	+84	+33	+45	+3

Notes: Column 3 "Language": G = German, Cz = Czech, E = English, D = Danish, N = Norwegian. Column 4 "Frequency": w = weekly, d = daily, m = monthly, 2w = biweekly.

Sources: N. W. Ayer and Sons, *American Newspaper Annals*, 1886-1900 (Philadelphia, 1886-1900); George P. Rowell and Co., *American Newspaper Directory*, 1886-1900 (New York, 1886-1900); Michael Schaack, *Anarchy and Anarchists*; Frantisek Stedronsky, *Zahranicni krajanske noviny*; *Immigrant Labor Press in North America*.

Throughout the 1870s and 1880s Chicago's radicals competed with a workingman's or labor press. In the 1870s the chief competition came from the *Workingman's Advocate*, which appeared in 1864 and died in 1877. In late 1879 and early 1880 several papers tried to present the Greenback party to Chicagoans; none survived more than a year. Then from 1881 to 1883, the *Progressive Age* proposed "to wage relentless war on the grasping and soulless corporations and monopolies which threaten the very existence of the Republic." The Trades Assembly endorsed that paper in September 1881, then bought it; in 1882 the Knights of Labor's District Assembly 24 extended its endorsement and it became, for a while, the Knights' official city organ. When a new editor championed temperance, the Trades Assembly withdrew its support and started the short-lived *Western Workman*.²³ A fourth competitor came from the SLP's remnants who hoped "to annihilate the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* . . . to kill that paper so dead that . . . there will be no more Anarchists." The *Illinois Volkszeitung*, a weekly coedited by Julius Vahlteich and Hermann Walther, appeared in May 1884 but issued from New York; only the inner pages came from Chicago. Within a year the Chicago section repudiated that paper when it fell into the hands of a clique which had "betrayed the party."²⁴

Measured by either longevity or circulation the radicals won that competition. The growth of a socialist and later anarchist readership was neither the result of entrapment nor the product of default. These papers could speak to Chicago's immigrant workers; they tried to speak for them as well.

The Great Upheaval and the Haymarket Affair

In 1884 the forerunner of the American Federation of Labor had designated May 1, 1886, for the inauguration of the eight-hour working day. The proposal died for lack of interest. A year later, the unskilled and unorganized workers revitalized that movement, and the skilled and organized found themselves drawn into something they had not started and seemingly disdained. On the eve of what Selig Perlman labeled the Great Upheaval of 1885-86, Chicago's labor movement embraced only a minority of the working class: about 10 percent of the city's wage earners had been enrolled and none of the city's trades was fully organized. It was the unskilled and unorganized, rather than the Knights of Labor, Trades Assembly, or CLU, who became the driving force for the eight-hour day. Indeed, the Trades Assembly did not establish its Eight Hour Committee until October 1885; as late as December only eleven of its twenty-five member unions had en-

dorsed the movement. At the local and national levels the leadership of the Knights of Labor was similarly unenthusiastic. In January 1886 the *Alarm* complained that "the Trades and Labor Assembly has done little or nothing. . . . Thus far the only large mass-meetings in behalf of the 'Eight Hour Movement,' have been held by those who have been accused of being opposed to the movement . . . the 'ignorant foreigners' who follow the red flag."²⁵

The anarchists initially dismissed the eight-hour movement, regarding it as a compromise. But led by some of its most active unionists the CLU dragged the IWPA into that struggle; as the winter of 1885–86 set in, both organizations became enthusiastic. They scheduled weekly, then almost daily mass meetings in every part of the city, addressing audiences in as many as seven languages. Their papers carefully recorded the frenzy of unionization. By spring the *Vorbote's* last page was filled with the announcements and reports of union meetings. Under the heading "Stadt Chicago" the April 21 issue, for example, reported meetings of the Möbel-Arbeiter [Furniture Workers] Union No. 1; a mass meeting outside Pullman where the Metall-Arbeiter Union gained fifty new members and the Möbel Arbeiter Union No. 3 initiated seventy-five; the Linseed Oil Arbeiter; the masons; the tanners; the butchers (with forty-five new members); the carpenters (fifty-four new members in two new locals); the saddlers ("50 neue Mitglieder"); and the Metall-Arbeiter Union, which gained ninety-six new members for a total "über 900." The anarchists carried a sense of urgency to the movement, and they also brought a cadre of organizers.²⁶

The anarchist press continued to be provocative and inflammatory. From December 1885 to March 1886 the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* offered free weapons instruction at an anarchist saloon; the *Alarm* simultaneously advertised an armed section of the American Group; the Lehr- und Wehr-Verein and the Bohemian Sharpshooters, another socialist paramilitary group, were seen drilling on the prairies; the CLU's leading unions declared their militancy. Military rhetoric permeated every discussion of the labor movement and class relations. On May Day, the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* called: "Bravely forward! The conflict has begun. An army of wage-laborers is idle. Capitalism conceals its tiger claws behind the ramparts of order. Workmen, let your watchword be: No Compromise! Cowards to the rear! Men to the front! The die is cast." The anarchist press held a strategic position during the Great Upheaval. The CLU's official organ remained labor's only voice by default: the *Knights of Labor* did not appear until March, and the Trades Assembly depended on the sufferance of the commercial press. But whatever the source, Chicago's businessmen responded to that rheto-

ric by expanding the police force, massing Pinkerton detectives and police specials, and mobilizing the state militia. The Commercial Club reviewed both cavalry and infantry riot drills, and Philip Armour, the meatpacker, subscribed \$2,000 for a new Gatling gun for the militia.²⁷

On May 3, 1886, the police attacked a group of strikers outside the McCormick Works. August Spies raced back to the *Arbeiter-Zeitung's* offices to dash off a broadside for a protest meeting; the composing-room foreman added the word "Revenge." The next night another detachment of police, the "flower of the Central Detail" marched into the Haymarket Square prepared to break up a small group of workingmen. A bomb exploded in their ranks, chaos ensued. Seventy policemen and an unknown number of workers were killed or wounded.

Proper Chicagoans knew whom to blame. The day after the Haymarket Riot, the police marched into the SPS's offices and arrested everyone they found. They returned that afternoon, arrested a few more, and confiscated manuscripts, galleys, books, and records. A second set of raids hit fifty anarchist halls and the Czech newspapers. At Florus Hall the police found "a subscription list . . . to the *Arbeiter-Zeitung*"; at *Budoucnost's* office they got "a complete list of subscribers." In June a grand jury indicted thirty-one Chicagoans for conspiracy in the Haymarket Riot. Only eight men actually stood trial, and six—George Engel and Adolph Fischer from the *Anarchist*, Albert Parsons from the *Alarm*, Michael Schwab, August Spies, and Oskar Neebe from the SPS—were directly connected to the city's anarchist press. (Mikolanda, from *Budoucnost*, was later convicted for a separate offense.) The Haymarket trial convicted, and then executed or imprisoned, the movement's most prominent leaders. A decade-long red scare, conducted by both the public and private sectors, intimidated the active membership and sympathetic following.²⁸

After Haymarket

Despite the executions and intimidation, the radicals and their newspapers did not disappear. The Socialist Publishing Society's three papers reappeared first. With type set and ready to go to press on the Thursday after the riot, no shop in the city had been willing to print the papers. Oskar Neebe then secured new offices, the society finally bought its own printing press, and *Die Arbeiter-Zeitung* resumed publication on May 8, 1886. Facing the mayor's promise to suppress any inflammatory material, Spies and Schwab continued to write "the principle [*sic*] editorial matter" from their jail cells. After their executions, a new set of editors successively filled their positions. Once hailed by

Marx as "the philosopher of the proletariat," Joseph Dietzgen resigned his position on New York's *Der Sozialist* and edited *Die Arbeiter-Zeitung* for almost two years until his death in April 1888. Albert Currin, a major figure in St. Louis's 1877 general strike, stayed a bit longer. They shared editorial responsibility with Gustav Belz, president of the metal workers' union and secretary of the CLU. Jens Christensen and Simon Hickler took over after Belz's untimely death in October 1888, and managed the three papers through the 1890s.²⁹

Prace [Labor] reincarnated *Budoucnost* in October 1886. Again edited by Josef Pecka, it issued from the same office. Both papers started as dailies, then became weeklies; but the former was an anarchist paper, an official IWPA organ; edited and printed by anarchists, the latter was a labor paper funded by local Bohemian unions. The carpenters in Local 54 provided capital and a publication committee, promising "to make it the publication of all labor groups, to be supported by all labor groups, so that it would continue to function on a permanent basis." The local considered its outright purchase, but with only 250 members and a treasury of \$400 the deal collapsed. "A great many difficulties arose," then "All locals were requested to contribute to the support of this publication, and all members instructed to purchase and read it, to pay up an advance subscription." The CLU twice extended its financial support, to no avail; the carpenters pulled out. *Prace* died in July 1887, leaving "bad feelings and hot blood amongst the [union's] members, in some for years, in some forever."³⁰

In spring 1887, Joseph Buchanan moved his *Labor Enquirer* from Denver to Chicago. Buchanan held membership cards in the International Workingmen's Association and the Knights of Labor; with a foot in two camps (like Parsons), he was misunderstood by both. The *Chicago Labor Enquirer* appeared as a biweekly; facing two rivals, it remained insolvent, the post office refused to deliver it, and news carriers were warned not to touch it. Buchanan cut back to a weekly, hoping for expansion, but the subscription list "was never more than one twentieth of what it should have been." He cut his staff and set his own type. The *Alarm* conceded that Buchanan was "a revolutionary socialist," but complained that "the *Enquirer* could never be called a socialistic paper. It advocated radical reform in a vague sort of way that left the reader in considerable doubt." From New York the Socialist Labor party warned that Buchanan had rejected "the control of organized labor." In August 1888 he dismissed his staff and sent his paper's obituary and subscription list to Henry George. The next day Buchanan resigned from the SLP—but he had already been expelled.³¹

The *Alarm* reappeared in November 1887, eighteen months after the

riot, six days before the executions. A four-page weekly like its namesake, it survived for twenty-two months, but was published in Chicago only for the first five. A Knight, and a member of the SLP and later the IWPA, Dyer Lum, the new editor, had come from an anarchist paper in Kansas and had been a contributor to the first *Alarm*. While Lucy Parsons and Sarah Ames invited Lum to edit the new paper, August Spies feared competition with Buchanan's paper and warned the CLU not to extend its support. With Lizzie Holmes returning as assistant editor, the new paper looked like the old; but Lum was not Parsons. He highlighted free thought, disdained the United Labor party, all but ignored the labor movement, and addressed the *Alarm* to a shrinking readership. After the paper moved to New York, a single column on the third page carried "Our Chicago Letter." The second *Alarm* had changed.³²

Three Scandinavian papers were published in the 1890s, on soil left fallow for a decade after *Den Nye Tid*'s death. For eighteen months in 1889–90, Louis Pio issued *Samfundet* [Society] as an "Illustrated Monthly for Scandinavian Literature, Family and Community Life." In it he published articles on cooperatives, Marx, parliamentary socialism, and the local community. *Revyen* [The Review] appeared in March 1894 as a Danish weekly and ran through September 1921. Edited by Christian Botker, a journalist who arrived in Chicago in 1891, it neither sought nor earned the SLP's endorsement, but reportedly enjoyed the largest circulation and longest life of any Danish socialist paper. Edited by John Glambeck, a clerk, *Arbejderen* [The Worker] appeared in July 1896, survived only four years, but was an official SLP organ. Like *Revyen*, *Arbejderen* maintained its autonomy through 1921, but at the cost of militancy. Both sold their subscription lists to commercial immigrant papers.³³

By May 1889, the radicals had restored their press to pre-Haymarket levels. The SPS still published three papers: *Prace* replaced *Budoucnost*, the *Labor Enquirer* and Dyer Lum's *Alarm* stood in for Parsons's original *Alarm*, and *Den Nye Tid*'s editor had returned with *Samfundet*. That roster continued to grow. Between 1886 and 1900 Chicago's socialists and anarchists issued thirty-six newspapers, published in seven languages: seven each in English and Czech, six each in German and Polish, three each in Danish and Lithuanian, and one in Italian. (See table 2.)

Three new German papers appeared after Haymarket. The Central Labor Union announced a new official organ in February 1888. The *Arbeiter Stimme* "will be a weekly," reported the *Alarm*, "and 25,000 copies are to be guaranteed for five weeks at least." The *Arbeiter Stimme*

became the CLU's German competitor to the Trades Assembly's new English *Record*; we know nothing, however, about its editors, editorials, circulation, or even its history (if any) beyond those five issues. Five years later, the SLP's German section reactivated the *Illinoiser Volks-Zeitung*. Subtitled "Den Interessen den Arbeitenden Volkes gewidmet" and published by the Deutscheverein Druckerei with a Typographia No. 9 union label, it appeared in March 1893, and probably ran several months. In spring 1896, Max Baginski offered the *Sturmglöcke* as an anarchist weekly; it collapsed after four issues. These three papers remain unknown beyond their first issues.³⁴

Chicago's Czech socialists and anarchists tried repeatedly to establish a solid journal in the 1890s. *Pravo Lidu* [Rights of the People], a daily "Dedicated to the Interest of the Working People," ran from May 1893 through August 1894 and was succeeded by *Duch Volnosti* [Spirit of Freedom], a monthly organ of the IWA. *Hlas Svobody* [Voice of Freedom], another daily, ran from January through May 1896, followed immediately by *Pochoden* [The Torch], a weekly, from June 1896 through May 1899, and *Revoluce*, an ephemeral social-revolutionary paper issued in 1897. In March 1900 the Czech section of the Socialist party in America began *Spravedlnost* [Justice], first as a weekly, later a daily; it survived through 1941. Josef Pecka, the former editor of *Budoucnost* and *Prace*, stayed on to work on *Pravo Lidu* and *Hlas Svobody* and represented the old guard; Frantisek Hlavacek, who debuted in Chicago with *Pochoden* and later edited *Spravedlnost*, represented newer, younger immigrants.³⁵

The SLP's English section issued two new papers in the 1890s. An eight-page weekly, *Chicago Labor*, was printed in St. Louis, and only the last page carried local news. In sixteen months, from August 1893 to December 1894, it went through at least three local editors, including John Glambeck, the section's Danish organizer, and J. Hubert de Witt, a "young, brilliant and energetic young man." Local reports were buried on the last page, jammed between local ads; before reaching them, a Chicago reader had to wade through the SLP's national platform, reports from the New York sections, and national ads. After sixteen months Chicagoans wanted their own paper, and the *Socialist Alliance* appeared as the monthly organ of the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance in July 1896.³⁶

Perhaps the most fascinating phenomenon of the 1890s was the development of a socialist press within Chicago's Polish and Lithuanian colonies, communities traditionally regarded as either priest-ridden or Democratic. Between 1889 and 1900, five radical Polish papers—four weeklies, one biweekly—appeared in Chicago; only one has been

Table 2

The Roster and Circulations of Chicago's Socialist and Anarchist Press, 1886-1900

Paper	First Issue	Last Issue	Language	Frequency	1886	1888	1890	1892	1894	1896	1898	1900
Vorbote	1874	1924	G	w	8,000	5,000	3,150	3,575	4,000	7,300	6,150	5,000
Arbeiter-Zeitung	1876	1919	G	d	5,780	5,000	4,600	5,800	7,145	15,120	12,560	10,000
Fackel	1877	1919	G	w	12,200	7,500	16,000	20,000	24,160	24,600	19,800	15,000
Budoucnost	1883	1886	Cz	w	750							
Alarm	1884	1886	E	w	3,000							
Lampcka	1885	1886	Cz	w	750							
Anarchist	1886	1886	G	m	300							
Prace	1887	1887	Cz	w	2,000							
Labor Enquirer	1887	1888	E	w		2,000						
Alarm	1887	1889	E	w								
Arbeiter Stimme	1888	1888	G	w		5,000						
Glos Wolny	1889	1890	P	w								
Samfundet	1889	1890	D	m								
Nowe Zycie	1889	1896	P	w				5,000	7,000			
Freedom	1891	1892	E	m								
Reforma	1891	1892	P	w								
Chicago Labor	1893	1894	E	w								
Grido d. Oppressi	1893	1894	It	w								
Pravo Lidu	1893	1894	Cz	d					400			
Ill. Volks-Zeitung	1893	1896	G	w								
Gazeta Robotnicza	1894	1894	P	2w								
Revyen	1894	1921	N	w						2,000	2,000	1,080
Duch Volnosty	1895	1895	Cz	m								

Paper	First Issue	Last Issue	Lan- guage	Fre- quency	1886	1888	1890	1892	1894	1896	1898	1900
Sturmglöcke	1896	1896	G	w								
Hlas Svobody	1896	1896	Cz	d						400		
Socialist Alliance	1896	1898	E	m						10,000		
Pochoden	1896	1899	Cz	w							400	
Arbejderen	1896	1900	D	w							2,800	2,800
Amerikos Lietuvis	1897	1897	Lith	w								
Revoluce	1897	1897	Cz									
Social Democrat	1898	1898	E	w								
Anarchistas	1899	1899	Lith	m								
Workers Call	1899	1902	E	w								
Sila I Postep	1899	1901	P	w								
Kurejas	1900	1901	Lith	w								
Robotnik	1900	1906	P	w								
Spravedlnost	1900	1941	Cz	w								5,000
Totals					32,780	24,500	23,750	34,375	42,705	59,420	43,710	33,880
Number change					-3,039	-8,280	-750	10,625	8,330	16,715	-15,710	-9,830
Percent change					-10	-25	-3	+45	+24	+39	-26	-22

Notes: Column 3 "Language": G = German, Cz = Czech, E = English, P = Polish, D = Danish, It = Italian, N = Norwegian, Lith = Lithuanian. Column 4 "Frequency": w = weekly, d = daily, m = monthly, 2w = biweekly.

Sources: N. W. Ayer and Sons, *American Newspaper Annals*, 1886-1900 (Philadelphia, 1886-1900); George P. Rowell and Co., *American Newspaper Directory*, 1886-1900 (New York, 1886-1900); Henryk Nagiel, *Dziennikarstwo polskie w Ameryce*; Frantisek Stedronsky, *Zahranicni krajanske noviny*; Frank Lavinskas, *Amerikos Lietuviu Lakrasciai*; Immigrant Labor Press in North America.

preserved. *Głos Wolny* [the Free Voice] came to Chicago in 1889 as a socialist paper but sold its subscription list, fourteen months later, to the Polish Roman Catholic Union (PRCU). *Nowe Życie* [New Life] came next and ran almost seven years, from 1889 to 1896. *Reforma* started in Chicago in 1891 as a socialist paper, moved to Buffalo and affiliated with the PRCU within a year, and then returned to Chicago. *Gazeta Robotnicza* [Workers' Gazette], "an atheistic and anarchistic journal" edited by Józef Rybakowski, a baker, issued from January through May 1894. It "promoted anarchism," complained a bourgeois Polish paper, and "became a source of lies and ridicule against religion, society, and private property." Finally, *Siła I Postęp* [Strength and Progress] began as a free-thought paper but later served as the organ of the SLP's Polish section from 1899 to 1901.³⁷ At the turn of the century Józefas Laukys, a printer, offered three successive Lithuanian papers. The first, *Amerikos Lietuvis* [American Lithuanian], a "radical socialist" paper, lasted but three issues in 1897; *Anarchistas* was intended as a monthly, but enjoyed only a few issues in 1899; and the third, *Kurejas* [the Creator] "attempted to publish anarchist, free-thinking and nationalist ideas" in nineteen issues in 1900.³⁸

The roster of Chicago's socialist and anarchist press from Haymarket to 1900 comprised thirty-six papers, published in seven languages, including three dailies, twenty-five weeklies, one biweekly, and six monthlies. The number of papers may be misleading, for few endured; but that growth, and its penetration into new communities, was remarkable. Circulation (based largely on German figures) fluctuated wildly in the 1890s, reflecting not only the business cycle but also the cycle of repression. Total circulation grew from about 32,780 in 1886 to a high of 59,420 in 1896, then fell to 38,880 in 1900—somewhere between 2 and 4 percent of the city's population. Scourged by both political repression and economic depression, the life expectancy of the radical press varied by language. The German papers proved the most durable, the Scandinavians came second, followed by the Polish and Czech papers. In comparison the English papers all died young. None survived as long, but the gaps in their publishing history were never glaring. A new paper, with a new name and editors, always appeared. The effort of founding and maintaining a multilingual press was apparently justified.

After the Knights of Labor purged the anarchists, some of Chicago's trade unions let repentant socialists back in, at the cost of their propaganda but not their militance. Stripped of their politics, ex-radicals proved good unionists. The relationship between the socialist press and organized labor changed too. As anarchists became a liability, as

socialism became expendable, the intimacy of that relationship was lost in the 1890s. The class-consciousness of the 1880s gave way to craft sectionalism. The Möbel-Arbeiter Union got its own paper in 1883 (*Die Möbel-Arbeiter Journal*, published in New York), as did the German and Czech bakers (1889, the *Chicagoer Bäcker-Zeitung*; *Cesky pekar*), the saddlers (1891, *Sattler und Wagenbauer*), the furniture workers (1896, *International Wood Worker*), and the carriage workers (1899, *Carriage and Wagon Workers' Journal*). If several unions stayed close to the Socialist Publishing Society, most moved on, not to business unionism but back to the SLP, then to Debsian social democracy, still later to the Socialist party and the Industrial Workers of the World.³⁹

A decade of repression changed the content and trajectory of the radical press. The inflammatory rhetoric, the ads for the Lehr- und Wehr-Verein, the articles on dynamite, even the initials IWPA, disappeared immediately. In Haymarket's wake the press dropped its "anarchist" pretensions, renounced revolution, and reembraced socialist electoral politics. Even after Judge Tuley's 1889 decision that "anarchists have the same rights as other citizens," discretion reduced the names and detail in meeting reports. The socialist press still covered the labor movement, but with a bit less urgency, and, after Dietzgen's death, much less theory. When the Pullman strike broke out in May 1894, *Der Vorbote* and *Die Arbeiter-Zeitung* offered extensive coverage and voiced their outrage. But as the strike dragged on, both papers reduced their coverage. Beyond an almost perfunctory solidarity, Chicago's former anarchists became distant and uninvolved, and their initial sympathy gave way to a cynical defeatism and then disgust. By 1909 *Die Arbeiter-Zeitung* conceded that "the pain and fury" of the Haymarket tragedy had "been corrupted to sweet nostalgia." A year before, *Die Fackel*'s editor complained:

Where are they gone, the many who only a few years ago helped to build and to extend the new working-class movement? Many have turned completely bourgeois, and only a small number at least keep in touch with the organized workers by reading a radical paper of some kind. . . .

While it used to be that those active in the movement for at least ten years, some years later, one could count oneself fortunate if he saw the same faces for five years. But nowadays, they participate no longer than two years.⁴⁰

If we measure by date of birth, by progeny, by circulation, or by longevity, it would be difficult to underestimate the saliency of the German radical press to the socialist and anarchist movements. The German socialist papers appeared first, issued more titles, enjoyed

higher circulations, and survived longest. While *Der Vorbote's* fifty-year run (1874–1924) was remarkable, mere survival should not be the only way of judging the radical press. *Die Fackel* died in 1919, *Die Arbeiter-Zeitung* and the *Vorbote* hung on through another red scare. As late as 1924, with a circulation of about eight thousand, the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* was still owned by the Zeitung Publishing Company, the Central Committee of the Socialist party, Brewery Workers', Beer Bottlers', and the Bakers' and Confectionary unions.

Writing thirty years ago, Carl Wittke argued that the foreign-language press in America was "the voice, the mirror, and the most active catalyzer of the life of any immigrant community." Chicago's foreign-language press illuminates those communities far better than the *Tribune* or *Inter Ocean*. But Wittke's argument remains blind to class, generalizing from bourgeois papers while largely ignoring the proletarian press. It is clear that Chicago's polyglot socialist press became a voice, mirror, and catalyst in the city's working-class communities. Thus *Der Vorbote's* assertion that "the history of the labor movement is simultaneously the history of the labor press" takes on new meaning. *Die Arbeiter-Zeitung*, for example, tells us more about Chicago's German workers than either the Republican *Illinois Staats-Zeitung* or the Democratic *Neue Freie Presse*. While their contents are lost to us now, the presence of *Glos Wolny*, *Kurejas*, and *Grido degli Oppressi* were important to the development of an urban socialist movement a century ago. Because Chicago's population was multiethnic, its historians will have to be multilingual if we are to move from labor, radical, or social history toward a history of society.⁴¹

NOTES

I want to thank Frances Mateyko, Paul Street, Richard Altenbaugh, and the editors for their critiques of earlier drafts.

1. *Vorbote*, Apr. 3, 1880, p. 1. *The Immigrant Labor Press in North America* should become the standard guide and finding tool.

2. See Henry David, *History of the Haymarket Affair*; Paul Avrich, *Haymarket Tragedy*; and Bruce Nelson, *Beyond the Martyrs*.

3. "Zur Geschichte der Chicagoer Arbeiter-Zeitung, des Vorboten, und der Fackel," *Chicagoer Arbeiter-Zeitung* [ChAZ], June 21, 1888, p. 1; Jacob Winnen, "Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung von Chicago," *Fackel*, Mar. 4, 1917, p. 1; and Renate Kiesewetter, "Institution der deutsch-amerikanischen Arbeiterpresse," pp. 12–15.

4. Hartmut Keil, "German Immigrant Working Class of Chicago," p. 167.

5. Louis Pio, *Til de skandinaviske Arbejdere*; Johannes Wist, "Norsk-Ameri-

kanernes Presse," pp. 82–83, 87–88, 92–93; Jens Engberg, *Til Arbejdet! Liv Eller død!* and Oddvar Bjorklund, *Marcus Thrane*.

6. *Vorbote*, Oct. 6, 1877, p. 5; *Socialist*, Sept. 14, 1878, p. 1; *Proceedings of the SLP Convention, 1879–1880*, 7, Socialist Labor Party of America Records [SLP Records], Wisconsin State Historical Society [WSHS], microfilm edition, 1970, reel 35.

7. *Budoucnost*, June 16, 1883, p. 1; "A True Bohemian" to editor, *Chicago Mail*, May 10, 1886, p. 1; Francis Hlaváček, "Zlomky českého počátečního," pp. 79–81; Josef Polišenský, "Český podíl na předhistorii Prvního máje," in *Začiatky českej a slovenskej emigrácie do USA*.

8. *Alarm*, Dec. 27, 1884, p. 2; Albert Parsons, *Anarchism*, p. 173; Herbert Gutman, "Alarm: Chicago and New York," pp. 380–86.

9. *Svornost*, May 7 and 11, 1886, both p. 4; *Chicago Tribune*, May 7, 1886, p. 2. In *Dějiny Čechů v Amerických Jan Habenicht* identified *Lampcka* as an "anarchistic" paper (p. 607), although Tomáš Čapek (*Padesát Let Českého Tisky v Americe*, p. 131) identifies it as a "humoristicko-satirický" weekly. The contradiction cannot be resolved: there are no issues extant.

10. *Vorbote*, Dec. 23, 1885, p. 8. The Julius Grinnell Collection has two issues of the *Anarchist*; see John Kebabian, *Haymarket Affair*.

11. *Formation of the Workingmen's Party*, p. 31; Louis Pio, *Den Lille Amerikaner*, p. 12; Paul Le Blanc, "Revolutionary Socialism," p. 199.

12. Paul Buhle, "German Socialists and the Roots of American Working-Class Radicalism," p. 230.

13. Floyd Dell, "Socialism and Anarchism in Chicago," p. 391; cf. George Schilling to Lucy Parsons, Dec. 1, 1893, George Schilling Collection, Illinois State Historical Library, Springfield.

14. *Socialist*, Mar. 15, 1879, p. 4; Hartmut Keil, "Knights of Labor."

15. *Vorbote*, Aug. 4 and 25, 1877, both p. 2; *ChAZ*, Apr. 26, 1884, p. 4; Apr. 13, 1884, p. 4; Nelson, *Beyond the Martyrs*, pp. 127–52.

16. Cf. "By-Laws of 'The Chicago Socialist Press Association,'" *Socialist*, Feb. 1, 1879, p. 8; and "Protokoll-Buch von der Illinoiser Volkszeitung Publishing Association, 1884–1885," Thomas J. Morgan Collection, Illinois Historical Survey, University of Illinois (microfilm edition: Urbana, 1969), reel 7; Kiese-wetter, "Institution der deutsch-amerikanischen Arbeiterpresse," pp. 28–49; *Vorbote*, Apr. 1, 1876, p. 1.

17. *Vorbote*, Dec. 22, 1883, p. 6; *Alarm*, Nov. 28, 1885, p. 1; *Formation of the Workingmen's Party*, p. 18.

18. Kiese-wetter, "Institution der deutsch-amerikanischen Arbeiterpresse," pp. 74–82; *Vorbote*, July 14, 1877, p. 2; *Fackel*, June 8, 1879, p. 8; *ChAZ*, June 27, 1882, p. 4; Thomas Robinson, "Chicago Typographical Union #16."

19. See a report from a Danish printer who worked with Pio in *Ugebladet*, June 22 and 29, 1922, trans. in Marion Marzolf, *Danish-Language Press*, pp. 42–43.

20. [Adolph Douai?], "Bericht über den Fortgang der sozialistischen Bewegung: Amerika"; Richard Ely, *Labor Movement in America*, p. 278.

21. From 1880 to 1886 the city's population grew by 64 percent; Michael Schaack, *Anarchy and Anarchists*, p. 216.

22. Elisabeth Pitzer, "Bürgerliche Presse und Arbeiterpresse im Wandel"; Habenicht, *Dějiny Čechů v Amerických*, pp. 604–9; Frederick Buchstein, "Anarchist Press in American Journalism," pp. 43–45, 66.

23. Neither the *Telegraph* nor the *Standard of Labor* have survived. For *Progressive Age*, and a brilliant exegesis of its leading columnist, see Richard Schneirov, "Knights of Labor in the Chicago Labor Movement," pp. 328–36, 318–27.

24. "Notes on Meetings of the SLP," Mar.-June 1884, Morgan Collection, reel 6; H. Walther to NEC, Jan. 9, 1885 (reel 5), L. Bonstein to NEC, Jan. 19, 1885 (reel 6), SLP Records.

25. Selig Perlman, "Upheaval and Reorganization"; *Alarm*, Jan. 23, 1886, p. 2; Keil, "Knights of Labor," pp. 301–23.

26. *Vorbote*, Apr. 21, 1886, p. 8; cf. *Chicago Tribune*, Apr. 19, 1886, p. 2; Bruce Nelson, "'We Can't Get Them to Do Aggressive Work.'"

27. *ChAZ*, May 1, 1886, quoted in *Concise History of the Great Trial*, pp. 20–21; *Chicago Tribune*, May 1, 1886, p. 2.

28. *Inter Ocean*, May 9, 1886, p. 2; *Chicago Tribune*, Sept. 1, 1886, p. 8; Nelson, *Beyond the Martyrs*, pp. 190–200.

29. *Alarm*, June 23, 1888, p. 4; Eugene Dietzgen, "Joseph Dietzgen"; on Belz see *Vorbote*, Sept. 5, 1888, p. 7; and his obituary, *ChAZ*, Oct. 10, 1888, p. 1.

30. Quotations from "History of Local No. 54," trans. H. Vydra (typescript, ca. 1922), pp. 9–11, Archives of the Chicago District Council, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America; František Štědronský, *Zahraniční krajanské noviny*, p. 104; Rudolf Bubenicek, *Dějiny Čechů v Chicagu*, p. 361.

31. Joseph Buchanan, *Story of a Labor Agitator*, pp. 331, 350–51, 452; *Vorbote*, Feb. 23, 1887, p. 7; *Alarm*, Sept. 1, 1888, p. 3. The *Enquirer's* rivals were the *Knights of Labor* and the *Daily Star Telegram* "published by the Knights of Labor Publishing Co."; a single clipping of the latter has survived in the Albert Parsons Papers, WSHS.

32. *Vorbote*, May 14, 1888, p. 4; May 30, 1888, p. 1; see Frank Brooks, "Industrialization and Radical Ideology."

33. *Samfundet*, May 1, 1899; *Arbejderen*, Mar. 11, 1897, p. 2; July 6, 1899, p. 2; *Revyen*, May 15, 1897, p. 1; May 5, 1900, p. 2; Danielsen, "Early Danish Immigrant Socialist Press," pp. 64–72.

34. *Alarm*, Feb. 25, 1888, p. 1; *Vorbote*, Mar. 14, 1888, p. 8; Karl J. R. Arndt and May E. Olson, *Deutsch-amerikanische Zeitungen und Zeitschriften*, pp. 58, 78. On the *Record*, see *Vorbote*, July 11, 1888, p. 8; there are five issues of *Illinoiser Volks-Zeitung* (Apr.-May 1893) at WSHS.

35. Štědronský, *Zahraniční krajanské noviny*, p. 106; Čapek, *Padesát Let Českého Tisky v Americe*, p. 132; Hlaváček, "Zlomky českého počátečního," pp. 82–90.

36. The Labor News Company of St. Louis, "a socialist newspaper union," offered "an eight page paper, [with] local matter . . . confined to the last page."

By 1895 it was published under different names in thirty-three cities. *Chicago Labor*, Aug. 12, 1893, p. 8; *Socialist Alliance*, June 1897, p. 1.

37. Henryk Nagiel, *Dziennikarstwo Polskie w Ameryce*, pp. 14, 108-9, 112, 118-20, 127; Wacław Kruszką, "Gazeciarstwo polskie w Ameryce," 5:57-58, 60, 65-66, 73; Stanisław Osada, *Prasa i publicystyka polska w Ameryce*, pp. 24-25, 26, 28; quotations from *Dziennik Chicagoski*, Apr. 21, 1894, p. 1.

38. Frank Lavinskas, *Amerikos Lietuviu Lakrasciai*, pp. 20, 34; *Immigrant Labor Press in North America*, 2:156, 166.

39. *ChAZ*, Nov. 1, 1886, p. 4; *Vorbote*, Nov. 10, 1886, p. 8; see *ChAZ*, July 16, 1888, p. 4.

40. Tuley quoted in David, *History of the Haymarket Affair*, p. 482; *Vorbote*, May-Oct. 1894; *ChAZ*, May-Oct. 1894, passim; *ChAZ*, Nov. 12, 1909, p. 2; *Fackel*, May 24, 1908, p. 4.

41. Carl Wittke, *German Language Press in America*, p. v; *Vorbote*, Apr. 3, 1880, p. 1.

Carol Poore

The *Pionier* Calendar of New York City: Chronicler of German-American Socialism

German radical immigrants to the United States were constantly seeking to expand the public reached by the socialist and labor press. One of the best examples of these efforts is the *Pionier*, an "illustrated people's calendar" published annually by German-American socialists connected with the *New Yorker Volkszeitung* (NYVZ) in New York City. The length of time over which this publication appeared and its high quality make it a fascinating and significant record of the importance these immigrant socialists attached to creating alternative reading matter for the working-class audience they had in mind. This discussion of the *Pionier* will treat the following points: (1) a brief historical overview of the genre of the calendar in Germany and its reworking by Social Democrats, (2) the publishing history of the *Pionier* within the context of the German-American socialist cultural milieu, and (3) an analysis of the *Pionier* itself.

After the invention of the printing press in the fifteenth century, calendars expanded from being mere tables of the days of the year, church holidays, and astrological and meteorological dates to include more and more practical information, didactic writings, stories, and various other forms of prose and poetry. They became popular reading matter, and it is easy to imagine that among groups of the population who could just barely read, such calendars were probably one of their only contacts with the printed word.¹ During the eighteenth century, in the course of the Enlightenment, various writers and pedagogues in Germany made efforts to raise the niveau of such calendars in order to use them for educating the lower classes. In the nineteenth century military, pedagogical, medical, or theological calendars began

to appear, creating a flood of calendar literature directed at specific occupational groups. Alongside this development, a number of well-known writers produced short stories which they called "calendar stories." These were not necessarily even meant to be published in calendars, but by choosing this genre designation writers indicated that they were creating a short prose form which would, or should, have a broad popular appeal. Perhaps the most important example from the twentieth century is Bertolt Brecht's *Kalendergeschichten* (1949), a collection of his stories, poems, and anecdotes which he compiled upon his return to Europe from exile. In these small, modest pieces, Brecht sought to revive a popular tradition of resistance to illegitimate authority, in opposition to the racist, chauvinist appeals to the *Volk* under the Nazis. It is worth quoting Michael Hamburger's introduction to the English translation of *Tales from the Calendar* (1961) in this regard:

In giving the book its title . . . Brecht consciously recalled the "peasant calendars" of an earlier age, when collections of satirical tales, fables, aphorisms and little descriptions of historical or everyday episodes were a traditional form of popular instruction and entertainment in rural areas. Though the form degenerated sharply after 1848, it maintained a shadowy existence, and Brecht's deliberate revival of the name and his choice of the contents are in accord with his clearly expressed view that the function of literature, whether in drama, verse or prose, is to stimulate, through entertainment, the wits, the social consciousness and the moral sensibilities of ordinary men and women.²

This form of calendar and of reading matter is familiar to all of us today. With respect to alternative groups, we need only to think of feminist calendars, ecology calendars, alternative history calendars—or in the Federal Republic of Germany: "red" calendars, calendars for progressive teachers, calendars for the civil-rights efforts of people with disabilities, and so forth.

From its beginnings, German Social Democracy valued highly this kind of popular reading matter.³ Along with various workers' calendars published in socialist circles, the Social Democratic party itself began to publish a calendar entitled *Der arme Conrad* ("Poor Conrad"—referring to the revolutionary peasants' league of this name in the Peasant Wars of 1524–26) immediately after its unification congress in Gotha in 1875. By 1878 the circulation of this calendar was about 60,000. Other party calendars also appeared, their combative, assertive edge blunted by censorship under the antisocialist laws of 1878–90. But one party calendar, the *Neue-Welt-Kalender*, was published continuously from 1883 to 1933. The Communist party of Germany (KPD) also published calendars beginning in the early 1920s, about which very little information

is available. We might surmise, though, that both the social democratic and the Communist calendars (as well as the *Pionier* in the United States) became somewhat less influential as time went by, due to the proliferation of other forms of mass entertainment and information—the growth of the press, magazines, movies, radio, sports, and other leisure pursuits which workers took part in.

An article published in Germany in the "Allgemeiner Arbeiter-Kalender für das Jahr 1886" stated the "cultural task" of the calendar as follows: "There are in fact books which are found in the poorest huts and which are therefore best suited to fulfill the mission of educating and enlightening the people: they are the calendars. A calendar is probably to be found in the most straitened household, and in some families it is the only source of intellectual stimulation for the whole year. Therefore, it is here that the lever should be applied, in order to have a meaningful effect on the education of the lower classes."⁴ This emphasis on education and enlightenment was nothing new in itself, but Social Democrats sought to transform the content of this education in accordance with their own goals. They kept the traditional structure and layout of other calendars, but the reading matter was often selected with a view toward its socialist political or cultural content. This would include calendar stories which depicted the life of the proletariat, satirical sketches attacking the parasitical, lazy rich, historical and biographical pieces, and reports on the labor movement abroad. Many of the authors were party functionaries—some, though not all, self-taught workers. During the period of the antisocialist laws, however, it was possible to continue this sort of satirical, polemical, informative writing only in the social democratic press published in exile (for example, in Switzerland), and the calendars published during this time took on a more entertaining and much less overtly political character.⁵

Coming from such traditions, it seems quite natural that German socialist immigrants to the United States would establish calendars with similar goals, aimed at a working-class reading audience. Besides the *Pionier*, I have located two others: the *Kalender des Philadelphia Tageblatt* (for the years 1899–1904; for 1903 and 1904 it is simply a reprint of the *Pionier* but published in Philadelphia), and the *New Jersey Arbeiter-Kalender* (for 1899, edited by Albert Gabriel in Newark "under the auspices of various unions"). No doubt these calendars were published over a longer period of time than I have found, and no doubt more calendars connected to the labor and socialist movements were published in other cities, but these were precisely the kind of ephemera rarely deemed worthy of collecting and preserving.

Fortunately, however, the *Pionier-Kalender* has been preserved. It was published annually by the NYVZ from 1882 to 1933, averaging about one hundred pages per issue.⁶ Furthermore, I have found two volumes of an *Illustrierter deutschamerikanischer Volkskalender* from the years 1938 and 1939 which are obviously continuations of the *Pionier*, judging from their layout and contributors.⁷ These two volumes were published by the "Arbeiter Kranken- und Sterbe-Kasse" (Workers' Sick and Death Benefit Society of North America, a large mutual aid society made up primarily of Germans with headquarters in Brooklyn). They are designated as the first and second volumes of the *Volkskalender*; therefore, it seems likely that due to the financial difficulties and reorganization of the NYVZ beginning in 1933, no *Volkskalender* was published in New York from 1934 to 1937. Probably the calendar did not last for long past 1939, since the Workers' Sick and Death Benefit Society dwindled in membership and became more and more exclusively concerned with providing financial benefits to its aging members rather than with other cultural tasks.

It is impossible to determine the circulation of the *Pionier*, although we can certainly see that it met with a good reception from the fact that it was published regularly over such a long period of time, that the Philadelphia *Tageblatt* copied it, and that for a number of years, the copies preserved note that they are the second or even third printing of the calendar. Circulation figures for the daily NYVZ during this period certainly show popular support: in 1878, for example, there were 4,000 subscribers, but 5,500 copies of first issue sold; by 1880 there were 10,200 (that the *Pionier* was already launched in 1882 testifies to the importance the NYVZ attached to putting out such a calendar); and the numbers grew, until in 1932 there were 23,000 subscribers.⁸ The calendar cost twenty-five cents for most of its life; by 1939 it cost forty-five cents—which might indicate that the circulation figures for the *Pionier* would be similar to those for the NYVZ.⁹

Perhaps the most impressive and touching thing about this publication to a reader who turns its yellowing pages today is the very high quality of its layout, printing, illustrations, and contents, indicating the time and great care which its editors and writers put into it. Who wrote for the *Pionier*? Its contributors included many of the German-American socialist journalists active in the political and union movements in New York—the reader familiar with the history of German-American socialism will recognize the names of Adolf Douai, Alexander Jonas, Hermann Schlüter, Jacob Franz, Julius Grunzig, Sergius Schewitsch, Ernst Schmidt (from Chicago), Julie Zadek-Romm, and many others. They were generally intellectuals who

cast their lot with socialism—although there were a few self-taught workers who also contributed. As was the case with the rest of the German-American socialist press, many pieces were taken over from the German press or calendars, but certainly a noteworthy amount of the material in the *Pionier* was written specifically for it and dealt with working-class life in the United States. Very little material was translated from English for inclusion, but a few notable examples are chapters from Jack London's *Iron Heel* and Frank Norris's *The Octopus* and reports by Job Harriman on labor struggles in the West. In other words, the *Pionier* focused significantly on American life and experiences, but generally from a German-American socialist perspective.

The general makeup of each issue was as follows: first, a picture on the title page, which might be a portrait of a revolutionary leader like Marx or Lassalle or a reproduction of a painting (perhaps from revolutionary history such as Adolph Menzel's paintings of 1848, but perhaps also a landscape or genre painting). Next would come the actual calendar section, with an illustration accompanying each month of the year, and lists of important dates including events from American and European progressive history. The longest part of the calendar was devoted to reading material, usually introduced by a poem for the year. The volume closed with advertisements and greetings from many socialist and labor fraternal organizations in New York City, and lists of books which could be ordered from the NYVZ.

In discussing the reading material, it is important to stress from the outset that by no means all of it was overtly political. Those pieces expressing a clearly socialist standpoint were definitely in the minority, but this accords with the editors' apparent goals—to integrate a socialist perspective into other reading experiences and needs, and into daily life. They wanted to appeal to a broad audience, not just to those who were already familiar with socialism, and who were politically committed. Therefore, the calendars offered a real potpourri of topics, literary genres, and fiction and nonfiction. It would be impossible here to give an exhaustive description and analysis of the extremely varied contents of the *Pionier* over fifty years. Instead, the following discussion will focus on the effort to develop alternative, entertaining reading matter which was meant to stimulate independent, critical thought and a will to resist the increasing commodification of all areas of life under capitalism.

The calendar contained a wide variety of anecdotes, jokes, poetry, and stories. The jokes might be directed against capitalists and the rich, but more often than not they could have been (and probably were) taken over from some nonsocialist German sources (jokes about

teachers and pupils, shrewish wives, drunken husbands, etc.). The poetry selections sometimes reprinted the inspired expressions of the 1848 revolution or included works by later socialist writers which reflected on historical events or called for solidarity. A good number were also sentimental lyrics which sang of love and landscape. The stories were also quite mixed. Some were clearly selected mainly for their entertainment value and could have been found just as well in the nonsocialist press (these usually dealt with some kind of love affair). Others had a more pronounced socially critical thrust, but it is important to note that these two tendencies existed along a continuum rather than being two sharply distinct themes. Even some of the more sentimental love stories and poems stated at times that love was more important than money, that there was hardly a place for true love any more in this increasingly materialistic world, or that free love was infinitely preferable to unhappy marriage based on private property and status-seeking. On the other hand, the stories and sketches which depicted the life of the proletariat or drew on themes from the labor movement often spiced up their naturalistic descriptions with liberal doses of sentimentality.¹⁰ For example, NYVZ editor Sergius Schewitsch contributed a sketch entitled "The Hun" to the 1890 volume. It is the story of a Russian immigrant who becomes a scab during a strike in Johnstown, Pennsylvania, out of ignorance and lack of knowledge of English. Treated badly by the strikers, he falls in love with a young German woman who believes that surely he would support his fellow workers if he only understood the situation. Finally, a great flood rushes through the valley one day, and he risks his life to save her. But when he returns to try to find the body of her dead father, the townspeople shoot him dead, believing he is robbing the corpses. In the end, "Marie was waiting in vain. There was one less 'hun' in the world" (p. 19). Or, in "Molly" (1906), Meta Lilienthal told the "everyday story" of a working-class woman who has an illegitimate child and has to leave it with an old woman while working as a nursemaid. The child receives poor care and finally dies. In 1933, Paul Mattick contributed a story called "The Bees" about a miner in an IWW strike led by Bill Haywood. In trying to prevent picket lines from being set up, the police kill the miner, who leaves behind a wife and children as numerous as "bees." Obviously, the writers of such stories sought to depict conflicts which were neglected in other literature. They wanted to stir the emotions and the consciences of their readers at the thought that such injustice and misery could exist in the land of opportunity.

The nonfiction pieces in the calendar can be divided roughly into three subject areas: popular science (articles on nature, astronomy,

travel, engineering, etc.); political, historical, and economic analyses; and literary and art history. An early article (from 1886) on modern railway travel established the tone struck in many of these pieces, when it acknowledged the speed and convenience of the train, but noted that along with this, people were losing a sense for the deliberate enjoyment of natural beauty and only wanted to say that they "had been there." A later article by Meta Lilienthal on "The Art of Enjoyment" (1910) noted that it would be a terrible accusation against our civilization if it were in fact true that working people trapped in cities in a monotonous working life were not really able to enjoy nature or beauty for their own sakes, with knowledge and appreciation. Along these lines, it was in fact the goal of much of the reading matter to encourage the reader to resist passive consumption by cultivating knowledge and aesthetic appreciation, and by pointing out the inequities in access to enjoyment under the capitalist system.¹¹ A good example is a series of articles on science and nature written by the self-taught Wilhelm Gundlach (1828–1913). Gundlach came to the United States in 1868 and was a freethinker, member of the First International, contributor to the *NYVZ*, and teacher in the German free schools. As his eulogy in the *Pionier* noted in 1914, however, his wife held the family together since he had no head for business! He viewed his main task in life as popularizing science for children and workers, and set out to do this in the articles he wrote for the *Pionier*. In "The Forces and Beauties of Nature" (1905), he notes that workers really need to be able to get out of the cities and enjoy nature, but that they have to pay to do this, while in the meantime, the rich are building their homes in lovely places like Mount Desert Island in Maine. After describing the flora, fauna, and geological features of some places that workers might visit if they had the money, Gundlach muses over the question of how many of the earth's treasures would be destroyed in the interests of capital. Similarly, in a 1906 article entitled "The Wonders of Nature in the Vicinity of New York," he assured his working-class readers that most well-off people would not be able to have such deep enjoyment of the wonders of nature as they would if they immersed themselves in study and really opened themselves to the many profound impressions to be experienced in nature. Then follows an informative article on the geology of New York harbor, where the emphasis lies on really looking at one's surroundings and knowing something substantial about them. Gundlach succinctly expressed the premise underlying all of these articles in a piece he wrote on Darwin in 1909, where he asserted that capital kept people ignorant, but that knowledge meant power (echoes of Wilhelm Liebknecht).

Another group of articles focused on history (usually of socialism) and on workers' struggles in the United States and Europe. For several years, a kind of editorial signed by the "Calendar Man" painted grim pictures of working-class life in the United States, explained the theory of surplus value in simple terms, and admonished its readers that the only possible response was to work for the realization of socialism by joining the Socialist Labor party or later, the Socialist party. Also, an annual "Year in Review" section provided a brief analysis of events of importance to workers in the United States and Europe. As early as 1924, the *Pionier* commented on the rise of Nazism in Germany. In 1931 it noted that General Ludendorff was calling for the annihilation of German Jewry, for the enslavement of Slavic peoples on German soil, and for the executions of the "stab-in-the-back traitors" (p. 21). In this same year, it explained the success of the Nazi party as due in part to its appeal to youth, but above all to the representatives of big industry and high finance who were supporting Hitler as the last hope of the bourgeoisie. Realizing that fascist dictatorship was a threat to the entire German working class, the "Year in Review" section expressed the hope that the two German workers' parties would unite against fascism rather than fight against each other (p. 102). The 1939 volume reported on the triumph of Nazism, on the Kristallnacht, and on the new wave of German Jewish exiles coming to the United States. It also contained an article by one Dr. Bernhard F. Mueller, "On the Problem of Race: Aryans and Jews," debunking Nazi racism (p. 56-58).

All of these articles, along with the dates selected as worthy of remembrance in the calendar section, were expressions of alternate views and perceptions of what was important in history and of efforts by oppressed groups of people to resist authority and assert their own subjectivity. However, the other side of this, which was characteristic of much of German-American socialism, was that in many of the pieces where the writers set out to give an explicitly political analysis of conflict, they tended to develop an accusatory or exasperated tone directed against what they saw as the unrevolutionary American working class. The editorials and news summaries would often end by bemoaning the fact that American workers were too dense to realize that they were oppressed, or too willing to enter into compromises with "petty-bourgeois" parties, or that yet another year had passed without anything of note to report about the workers' movement in the United States. However, such condescension appears only infrequently in the *Pionier*, and it is not a feature of the publication in general—a point to which we will return.

A third topic which occupied a significant amount of space was lit-

erary and art history—for example, a series of articles by Clara Ruge on social art and drama in the United States.¹² Her illustrated pieces on social art in America (1910 and 1917) discuss sculptures, paintings, and drawings, many by immigrant artists who often took their subject matter from working-class life in New York. The articles surveying modern social drama in America (1922 and 1926) focus on O'Neill and the Provincetown Players and also on antiwar plays. In her 1910 article, Ruge explained how she hoped to connect cultural and political goals: "The more we awaken an interest in artistic efforts among the people, above all among progressive workers, the more urgent their demands will be for intellectual pleasures, for the highest joys of life. The result is that the workers will grasp the social struggles of the present from a higher cultural standpoint, and they will engage in economic and political struggles with more perseverance and greater knowledge" (p. 81). This belief that aesthetic education (a salute to Schiller!) would necessarily lead to deeper, more knowledgeable political commitment and action can be taken as the driving hope underlying such socialist cultural efforts as the *Pionier* in general.

The belief in progress through enlightenment is also evident in the way in which the calendar used illustrations. These were many and various in each volume, including drawings, cartoons and caricatures, reproductions of paintings, photographs of sculptures, etc. Sometimes they would be accompanied by a short analysis pointing out important artistic techniques or social content, again from the perspective that the readers should learn to look at these artworks (and at the world) with a knowledgeable and critical eye. Like the reading material discussed here, although some of the art depicted struggles of the oppressed or important historical figures, much of it was clearly intended for the simple enjoyment of the readers, such as the numerous paintings of beautiful seminude or nude women, of mothers and children, of cute dogs and other animals, and of pleasant landscapes. It is easy to imagine that readers would have found this calendar a source of pinups, of reproductions of paintings, and of little political posters to tear out and hang on their walls. In fact, an anonymous author reflected on this in the women's section of the calendar in 1922, in an article entitled "On Hanging Pictures. A Part of Proletarian Culture." S/he made the point that workers (meaning women, who generally did the decorating) should think about what they hung on their walls and not have "petty-bourgeois" or "bourgeois" pictures, specifically ruling out pictures of soldiers and of church weddings! The author particularly recommended works by Käthe Kollwitz as appropriate (her works were frequently reproduced in the *Pionier*). This example shows

the efforts that these people were making to act consciously, even in the smallest aspects of daily life.

If it was to be mainly women who thought about and were responsible for decorating their homes, in part with illustrations like those reproduced in the *Pionier*, what can we say in more general terms about women and this publication? To what extent was it concerned with issues of specific importance to women, and to what extent did women contribute to it? At first, as was characteristic of German-American socialism in general, the *Pionier* devoted little space to questions of women's emancipation, and almost all of its contributors were men. Occasionally, however, there would be exceptions to this. In the first volume from 1882, for example, an immigrant named Doris Epstein wrote a piece entitled "Academic Experiences" on the difficulties she had experienced as a woman trying to study medicine in Leipzig and about her hopes to continue her studies in the United States. In 1883, the socialist journalist Alexander Jonas, who had been active in free thought and women's rights circles in New York during the 1870s, contributed an imaginative lecture from "Before the Ice Age" entitled "The Emancipation of Men." This recounted a story about a society at the North Pole where the roles of men and women were reversed and described a convocation of "men's rights advocates" who were ridiculed by the women present. During the 1880s and 1890s, a few stories appeared by writers like Minna Kautsky (reprinted from the German social democratic press) and Julie Zadek-Romm (who was active in German-American socialist circles in New York and who later edited the women's pages of the *NYVZ* until her death in 1916).

Over time, during the early twentieth century, the number of contributions by women increased, until a section of the calendar entitled "For the Woman of Labor" began to appear in 1922 (simply called "For Women" in 1938 and 1939 under the sign of the Popular Front). This section was usually about ten to twenty pages long and contained household hints, discussions of such topics as child-rearing, health, and sex education, as well as stories, illustrations, and political and cultural articles. In these statements we can see how the contributors understood their cultural task. One woman who wrote several pieces during the 1920s was Lily Lore, probably the wife of *NYVZ* editor Ludwig Lore. In her articles called "What the Movement Can Mean to Us" (1922) and "I Do My Duty!" (1923), she chastised housewives who said that they were too busy with family duties to come to meetings, or who were afraid to develop their own opinions, and urged them to become active in the workers' movement.

Other articles later on urged women to resist war with all the means

at their disposal by becoming active in the struggle against capitalism. One article from 1922 took a question as its title—"Working Woman, What Do You Read?" It can be taken as a programmatic statement for the goals of these women's pages. It criticized working women who thoughtlessly read or even subscribed to a bourgeois newspaper, who believed that the news was the same in any paper, and who read mainly for the short stories (here we could deduce that the short stories the *Pionier* contained would have made women more likely to read it). It pointed out that the bourgeois press would support factory owners against striking husbands of working-class women readers, and that its women's pages were written for women with money to squander on high fashion and gourmet recipes. Only one conclusion should be possible for the working-class woman, to "learn, read, and think," to read the NYVZ and the New York *Vorwärts* (and by extension, the *Pionier*).¹³ In other words, as the anonymous writer stated, the reader should consciously try to "connect" what she read in the press "with (her) own daily life" (p. 70). Again, we find the contradiction in some of these political and cultural statements that the writers (especially Lily Lore) sometimes adopt a rather accusatory and condescending tone toward women who were not active in the workers' movement, and it is easy to imagine that this would have put off some readers because of its arrogance. However, the actual content of the women's pages in the context of the entire calendar did have a definite thrust toward empowerment in many areas of daily life, toward encouraging women to think and act for themselves, and toward synthesizing political, cultural, and emotional needs in their lives.

Under the pressure of events and developments in the United States and Germany, a publication like the *Pionier* could not have lasted much longer than it did. The days in which Marxist socialism had been most firmly rooted in the German-American ethnic group had long since passed, and the older immigration of Germans had long been increasingly integrated into English-speaking America. By the late 1920s, there is a feeling in the pages of the *Pionier* that it was not expressing so much of a mission to effect social change in the United States as it had earlier. An article from the 1931 volume which described a group trip back to "the old homeland" planned by the NYVZ for the following year expressed the writer's lingering feelings of being out of place in New York in the following way: "Yes, I speak their language, and I make their gestures, so that I don't put people off or stand out in the crowd. You do some things because they really are better than what you did before. You do other things to keep from becoming a stranger to your

child. For I don't want my little girl to feel foreign in her homeland. She shouldn't want to emigrate and then become homeless inside like we of the older generation are now and will probably be until we die" (p. 50).

It is quite telling in this context that the 1938 and 1939 volumes were put out by the Workers' Sick and Death Benefit Society, an organization devoted especially to taking care of its aging radical members. Yet even at this late date, such an organization, and by extension, these last volumes of a publication like the *Pionier*, were anchored in an alternative, radical German-American sociocultural milieu which disappeared only after the war. Looking through the advertisements and congratulatory notices in the back of the calendar in 1933, and even in 1939, we see how active this socialist- or labor-oriented fraternal milieu still was—with mention of workers' singing societies, labor lyceums, various benefit societies, union activities, recreational and old age homes, etc.

One of the best personal statements about this milieu in which the *Pionier* was read is the memoirs of Meta Lilienthal, *Dear Remembered World* (1947).¹⁴ She was born in New York about 1876; her parents were highly educated German Jewish immigrants, active in women's rights and socialist circles. Between 1906 and 1919, writing sometimes under the pseudonym "Hebe," she produced half a dozen pieces for the *Pionier*, mostly on various aspects of women's history. She also published a translation of August Bebel's *Woman and Socialism* (1910) and other writings on women's rights. One chapter in her memoirs is devoted to the man she remembered fondly as her "spiritual parent," Alexander Jonas (founder of the NYVZ). She recalled that he would play with her like a child himself, but that also, on their walks through the city, "he aroused my consciousness of social wrong." It was Jonas's influence, she states, that led her "to champion social causes and to take an active part in public life" (p. 38). During her childhood, her parents' home was visited by a stream of "social reformers," including Henry George and Wilhelm Liebknecht, and she was always included in these gatherings. She describes the atmosphere there as follows: "As I participated in my parents' intellectual life, so also did I in their merry-making. Sometimes these serious minded people, these idealists and world reformers, would play games and perform charades and sing together, to familiar tunes, humorous verses that one or another of the group had composed. On these occasions there was much laughter. The men, particularly, shed their dignity and reverted to their student days" (p. 178).¹⁵ She recalled particularly vividly a New Year's

Eve spent alone with her father in about 1890, when he read Heinrich Heine's poems to her, talked of "countless things good and beautiful," and made a toast "to our fellow men" (pp. 180-81).

Publications like the *Pionier* sought in their own way to speak to all sides of life in this milieu, as we see in the following statement by its unknown editors upon the fiftieth anniversary of the calendar in 1931:

This year the *Pionier* is appearing for the fiftieth time. Every year for half a century it came as a loyal chronicler into the homes of German working men and women. It came to entertain, gladden and teach them, and last but not least, to give them renewed courage for the hard struggle of the progressive workers' movement on the stony soil of this country. The growing popularity every year of this genuine people's calendar shows that it did justice to its tasks. From the beginning, the calendar always had as its motto: for the worker the best is just good enough! The *Pionier* never offered the shallow, trivial reading of other calendars which spoils people's taste and makes them forget how to think. Like its mother, the NYVZ and its weekly edition, the *New Yorker Vorwärts*, the *Pionier* always sought to educate the workers, to inspire them to fight for their class, and to enable them to understand the beautiful and the noble.

If it accomplished these tasks in a modest way, it owes this to the active support and contributions of its large family, the men and women comrades. (p. 97)

Writing her memoirs after 1945, Meta Lilienthal gave an assessment of her "dear remembered world" which could just as well have applied to the *Pionier*, and the German-American radical press in general: "As, heartsick and disillusioned, I contemplate the material and spiritual wreckage of our present day world, I find it difficult to picture the kind of world my parents thought they were helping to build. But I do not feel that their ideal was a mistaken one. The social objectives for which they were striving—economic security, physical well-being and personal happiness for the great mass of mankind—still seem to me the goals most worthy of human achievement" (p. 176).

NOTES

1. For general information on the history of calendars and calendar stories in Germany, see: Gero von Wilpert, *Sachwörterbuch der Literatur*, p. 319; Ludwig Rohner, *Kalendergeschichte und Kalender*; Rudolf Schenda, *Lesestoffe der kleinen Leute und Volk ohne Buch*. On the history of German social democratic calendars, see Cäcilie Friedrich, ed., *Kalendergeschichten*. Most of my discussion of these calendars is based on Friedrich.

2. Michael Hamburger in Bertolt Brecht, *Tales from the Calendar*, trans. Yvonne Kapp and Michael Hamburger, p. 9.

3. Friedrich, *Kalendergeschichten*, pp. x-xi. See also the entry on calendars in *Lexikon sozialistischer deutscher Literatur*.

4. Friedrich, *Kalendergeschichten*, pp. ix-x.

5. *Lexikon sozialistischer deutscher Literatur*, pp. 268-70.

6. All volumes but 1920 of the *Pionier* are available between the Wisconsin State Historical Society and the New York Public Library.

7. The 1938 volume is available in the New York Public Library. Both the 1938 and 1939 volumes are in the Heinrich Bartel Collection of the Milwaukee County Historical Society.

8. Publishing information on the NYVZ is taken from the second edition of Karl J. R. Arndt and May E. Olson, *German-American Newspapers and Periodicals*.

9. An item from the socialist curiosity cabinet: Friedrich Sorge regularly sent the *Pionier* to the household of Marx for Helene Demuth, as we know from Engels's letters to Sorge of Sept. 29, 1889 and Oct. 18, 1892. Noted in Friedrich, *Kalendergeschichten*, pp. 262-63.

10. The actual effect of naturalistic depictions of misery and poverty has been hotly debated in socialist circles ever since the naturalism debate within German Social Democracy of the 1890s. See *Naturalismus-Debatte*.

11. For a more in-depth discussion of the problematic aspects of such attempts at "aesthetic education," see Peter Brückner and Gabriele Ricke, "Über die ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen"; and also Carol Poore, *German-American Socialist Literature, 1865-1900*.

12. Clara Ruge also wrote short plays which were published in the NYVZ's "modern library." To be found in the New York Public Library are her *On the Road: Drama in One Act*; *Raub: Soziales Drama*; and *Die Wiederkehr, ein Drama aus der Kriegszeit*. They are quite forgettable.

13. I was able to find one volume of the *Staats-Zeitung Kalender* from 1912 in the New York Public Library. The *Staats-Zeitung* (which still exists) was the main "bourgeois" competitor with the NYVZ, and the two newspapers were constantly feuding. To judge by their competing calendars, the *Pionier* was infinitely superior, as the *Staats-Zeitung* calendar contains nothing but dates and tables, with no effort at providing reading matter or an attractive layout.

14. The following works by Meta Lilienthal can be found in the New York Public Library: *Dear Remembered World*; *From Fireside to Factory*; and *Women of the Future*. Meta Lilienthal is also known by her married name, Meta Stern.

15. A wonderful recent evocation of this atmosphere is the scene in Margarethe von Trotta's film, "Rosa Luxemburg," of the Social Democrats' ball.

Ruth Seifert

Women's Pages in the German-American Radical Press, 1900–1914: The Debate on Socialism, Emancipation, and the Suffrage

In 1900, the *New Yorker Volkszeitung* (NYVZ) introduced a special "women's corner," particularly addressed to the wives of German workers and working women. Soon the women's corner expanded to become a women's page published weekly in the Sunday supplement of the NYVZ. The reason for establishing that page had less to do with concern for women than with the Socialist party's realization that it was hardly possible to build a viable cultural and organizational network among workers without the support and active engagement of women. The women's corner was to give ideological coaching to women, to make them familiar with socialist theory in general and the socialist position on the "woman question" in particular.

The belief that more attention to the woman question was necessary gained ground in the social democratic movement after the turn of the century. In Germany, the circulation of the *Gleichheit*, a social democratic monthly on women's issues read primarily by female functionaries, rose steadily from 4,000 in 1900 to 112,000 in 1913.¹ In New York by 1914, all but one of the foreign-language socialist newspapers had a women's page. Only the Finnish socialists of New York voiced the opinion that for them a women's page was anachronistic.² The NYVZ started a page edited by Johanna Greie-Cramer, who made it her explicit aim to familiarize women with socialist class theory. Greie-Cramer, too, was convinced that the socialist movement could not do without the consent and active engagement of working-class women. Moreover, some socialists, men as well as women, saw that gender

conflicts disturbed the unity of the working class and that ideological efforts were necessary to tackle that problem.³

From the viewpoint of the Social Democratic party of Germany (SPD) these ideological efforts were aimed not so much at integrating feminism into socialism but at convincing women of the overriding importance of the class struggle.⁴ The Socialist Labor party as well as the German-American socialists ascribed a low priority to female concerns.⁵ In spite of sympathies for the feminist cause, Johanna Greie-Cramer, just like Clara Zetkin in Germany, always put the class struggle before the gender struggle and resisted the enticements of the bourgeois women's movement. "The modern proletarian woman," she instructed her readers, "has no reason to get enthusiastic about the emancipatory endeavors of the world of the bourgeois woman. However, under certain circumstances, and if her own class interest is not affected, she will stand up for these demands, too, because it is a question of justice and equity."⁶ Her view of that problem was quite in accord with the party's official stance on the woman question: "the central theme of the women's struggle must not be interpreted as being directed against men, but rather it should include men, for the same forces which repress and tyrannize men keep women in bondage."⁷

As the women's page developed, though, it became clear that there was no uniform or generally agreed upon point of view on the woman question within the German-American socialist movement. This was partially due to the ideological situation to which German-Americans were exposed. In Germany, the Social Democrats were virtually the only large movement that had the power to make their demands for gender equality heard. The mainstream of the bourgeois women's movement in Germany was conservative, with only a small radical wing. The situation was different in the United States.⁸ Socialist women in New York became acquainted with progressivism, feminist radicalism, anarchism, and, most important, the suffrage movement. These movements advanced specific demands other than those the Socialist party deemed the most essential. Even though the editorial staff of the women's page regularly was recruited from class-conscious socialists, these women were also exposed to—and often fascinated by—the ideas and the personalities of the suffrage movement. While Greie-Cramer adhered to the opinion that the woman question was a secondary problem that would be resolved by the victory of the working class and that any cooperation with the bourgeois women's movement was a cardinal mistake, other editors and correspondents of the women's page did not share that viewpoint totally. Thus, the

NYVZ's women's page was never merely an instrument of instruction, but became a forum for discussion and negotiations about discourses of gender relations, women's issues, and life-styles.

In that respect, the women's pages in German-American papers differed greatly from comparable publications of the SPD, where neither controversies nor dissenting positions were frequently heard. In Germany, attempts to keep so-called bourgeois feminism at a proper distance were successful.⁹ There, topics of gender that could not be integrated into the discussion of the class struggle were banned from official discourse as of only "private" interest.¹⁰ In 1910, Meta Stern, daughter of the German-American freethinker Auguste Lilienthal and Greie-Cramer's successor as editor of the "women's corner" of the NYVZ, published an article on New York socialist women in the *Gleichheit*. In carefully chosen, nonprovocative words, she pointed out that the American situation was different from the German: "Here the position of socialist women towards the bourgeois women's movement is still an open question, there are no sharp demarcations. Socialist women support the women's movement as long as they do not have to give up socialist principles."¹¹

The women's page of the NYVZ published articles on a variety of topics which were considered to be of interest to women. In general, there was one editorial written by a member of the staff, and articles were frequently taken from the *Gleichheit* and other social democratic publications in Germany. The women's page also published contributions taken from the *Neue Generation*, the organ of the Bund für Mutterschutz (Association for Mothers' Protection), the moral reform movement founded by the liberal Helene Stöcker. Translations from other foreign-language women's pages were fairly common. As the American suffrage movement became increasingly important, the women's page also included articles taken from the *Progressive Woman*, a socialist women's publication loosely affiliated with the Socialist party, and the *Woman's Journal*, the official organ of the national suffrage movement. Articles by Charlotte Perkins Gilman, a leading feminist intellectual of her generation and author of *Women and Economics*, were printed with editorial approval by 1910.

The women's page also invited and published letters by readers. In the months just after the page was started, a flood of letters enthusiastically welcoming the women's page reached the editors. Women pointed out that the women's page was the first thing they read when they received the NYVZ, and that they were particularly eager to read the letters to the editors to learn about the lives of other women.¹² These letters are a unique source for the historian, giving insights into

the concerns of rank-and-file German-American working-class women that are not otherwise readily available. They show that among at least some of these women the need to discuss the gender situation was overwhelming. Women correspondents also tried to make sense of the social and cultural problems they faced and often were not content with the characterizations of social issues offered to them by the socialist movement. Many were not prepared to view the world merely through the perspective of class theory; that they should fight for socialism first and for female concerns later did not make sense to them.

In the course of time, a gender-based analysis of social and everyday problems became increasingly important for the editorial staff of the women's page as well as for rank-and-file American socialist women. These discourses on the gender struggle that were new to the socialist movement were never antisocialist.¹³ The destructiveness of class society was an immediate experience of most women involved in political life. At the same time, however, they saw the necessity of changing or at least reforming gender relations. This meant introducing other topics into the women's page than those the party, or even the editorial staff, preferred. The letters reveal that these working- and lower-middle-class women expressed their experiences as much in terms of gender as in terms of class. Women carried on discussions in letters to the *NYVZ*, trying to create a female perspective on such concerns as abortion, unhappy marriages, or prostitution that were tied up in a hegemonic male discourse. A vivid discussion among female readers on free love and marriage—rather an anarchist than a socialist topic—was carried on in 1901, and, not being political in the classical sense, was at first not wholeheartedly welcomed by the *NYVZ* or by Greie-Cramer. Both the female and the male readers' response to that topic was so strong, however, that for a short time the discussion was even carried into the "Löwenrachen," the "general" page for letters to the editor, which had been almost exclusively the domain of male readers. In general, the topics discussed in the "Löwenrachen" were not related to those on the women's page, but typically were questions of agitation, union organization, and general politics. For the *NYVZ*, questions of gender relations were a female topic and a female problem, not considered to be of great interest for male readers.

The "Löwenrachen" was different from the women's page in another way: male contributors to the "Löwenrachen" had no problem signing their letters with their entire name, while the women who sent letters to the women's page either signed with their initials or merely called themselves "a working woman," "a socialist woman" or "a German

woman." Often they doubted their own capabilities and apologized for their "dumb writing" or "deficient thinking," invoking the notorious female lack of self-assurance and self-esteem.

Attempts on the part of Greie-Cramer to lead the audience back to the "actual" problem, zealously emphasizing the economic basis of female hardship, caused unrest among German-American socialist women. As early as September 1900, there were complaints that women's letters to the column "For Women" were ignored and that the editor of the NYVZ should feel obliged "to lend a helping hand" to women, "since the existence of the women's corner is very helpful to our cause."¹⁴ Yet, in 1903, the NYVZ printed fewer and fewer letters addressed to the women's page and by 1904 the letters had—with just a few exceptions—disappeared. The articles presented in "For Women" in 1904 were almost exclusively written by men and had such titles as "Baby's Gymnastics," "On Fairy Tales," "Children and Poetry," or "What to Do against Coarse Skin." Articles on the wives of prominent socialist men were popular now, portraying the hard-working, wise, and practical homemaker creating a cosy home for husband and children and endowing him with motherly care.¹⁵ There were no hints in the newspaper as to discussions or conflicts in the editorial staff on this policy. After the editors reduced the scope of the women's page, reports on the activities of the women's branches in New York reveal that there were obstinate attempts on the part of socialist women's branches to reactivate it. They had regular meetings with the editorial staff of the NYVZ to negotiate the conditions for resuming the page. By fall 1906 their efforts were successful. The women's page was resumed under the direction of Meta Stern (in the years to come she wrote under the pseudonym of "Hebe"), who, in her first editorial, made clear what her intentions were: "From today on, this part of our newspaper belongs to us women in a more defined sense than before. It is to represent the interest of working-class women, in particular, socialist working-class women."¹⁶

Between the turn of the century and the beginning of World War I, the conflicts fought on the women's page were characterized by a specific kind of ambivalence about an explicit dedication to female emancipation, an implicit clinging to patriarchal prerogatives, and the attempt to reconcile these positions with socialist thought.¹⁷ Women editors and readers tried forcefully to write feminist demands into socialist theory and to make the movement accept their claims. As the American women's movement grew stronger and fascinated both the editors of the women's page and its readers, the necessity to deal with feminist demands in the socialist press became more acute. Thus, the women's

page was to some extent successful in introducing gender-related topics into the German-American socialists' discourse in America.

This was clearly an effect of exposure to the American gender situation. Before the end of the nineteenth century, special women's pages were not known in the German-American labor press, but discourses on woman and definitions of femininity abounded.¹⁸ These articles primarily expressed the irritation of German-born men about the situation with which they were confronted in the United States. Comparisons made between the situation in the new home and the old country played an important role in the discussions of gender relations carried on in the German-American socialist press. As the immigrants were confronted with a gender situation different from that in the German Reich, their reaction to the American situation was ambivalent and underwent changes in the course of time. Whereas in the United States "the 1880s and 1890s saw the emergence of a novel social and political phenomenon—the New Woman,"¹⁹ this kind of social and political awakening of women did not take place in Germany before the 1920s, when a "social earthquake" in the wake of World War I brought about a drastic change in gender relations.²⁰

Before World War I, female self-assertion or even militance was neither common nor acceptable to German-American socialists in their everyday culture.²¹ Even though Bebel's book *Woman and Socialism* was published in the United States in 1883, its impact on the treatment of the woman question in the socialist movement seems to have been negligible.²² In spite of theoretical lip service paid to women's emancipation, German-American socialists still cherished their traditional domestic life. According to a recent study, the Italian and Jewish ethnic cultures in America were the most patriarchal of the European immigrant groups,²³ but the German-American situation appears to have been quite similar. Time and again, there are hints in the German-American newspapers about the "cheekiness" and "impertinence" of American women and the "meekness" of American men. When talking about gender relations in their new home, words like "emancipation," "liberation," and "female consciousness" were not used in the socialist press. American gender relations were negatively contrasted to the neatness of the German ethnic setting, where patriarchal values still guaranteed an idyllic orderliness in marriage and family life—at least from a male point of view. In that respect, German-American socialists were much in accord with their bourgeois counterparts who "endorsed the myth that theirs was the only land where marriage was holy."²⁴

When trying to keep women in their place and encourage men to defend their hegemonic position, socialist newspapers worked with

images of "true womanhood" and expressed contempt for so-called male subservience. When reporting that a female cyclist defended herself against verbal harassment by hitting a man in the face, the *Chicagoer Arbeiterzeitung* commented that the man took the "humiliation" as they called it "with the usual American submissiveness toward everything [sic] that wears an apron or a petticoat." Moreover, he had to suffer derision from passersby, and, "to top it all," as the *Chicagoer Arbeiterzeitung* commented, even a policeman who was consulted "decided that the young lady was right."²⁵

In an article entitled "The New Woman," the *Chicagoer Arbeiterzeitung* defined their idea of what she is supposed to be, drawing a line between the liberated "bourgeois American" and the socialist "new woman": "The monster, which brainless journalists have proclaimed as the 'new woman,' in reality has nothing to do with that type of woman." Whereas in their opinion bourgeois women were a "mixture of falseness, coquetry and foolishness," the middle-class and the proletarian woman were thought to be different. These women had learned trades "to be able to make a living on [their] own." Thus, the *Chicagoer Arbeiterzeitung* claimed, "it is no longer necessary for her to play the doll, she stands independently at the side of the man and can possibly free herself from his despotism, because she can make it alone."²⁶

The NYVZ adopted a similar position in 1896, pointing out that "the 'New Woman's Movement' started with the introduction of bloomers and has not advanced much further during the past century . . . whereas working women have gained many a nice success" and are thus also distinguished from the "idle woman world" of the bourgeoisie.²⁷ Obviously, only *wage work* distinguished the "new woman" from "the old doll" in the view of the German-American labor press. In reality this meant a tremendous double burden for women, since their responsibility for housework was by no means lessened by these developments. Apart from that, they were to subscribe to the official discourse by maintaining all "womanly characteristics."²⁸ These views on women changed drastically when women themselves got a chance to voice their opinions on the women's page of the NYVZ. Many contributors to the women's page were well aware of the gains the "new woman" had made in the United States. To be sure, socialist women were eager to point out that it was only possible to be a "new woman" with a certain level of education and amount of income. Nevertheless they comment approvingly on a type of woman "for which the English language has already found a new name . . . : 'Bachelor Girl.' The

Bachelor Girl does not consider her life a failure. . . . Her work satisfies her. . . . Even without a husband, she has a home. Had the women's movement achieved nothing but this change in the position of the unmarried woman, just this would already have been tremendous progress."²⁹

While most women welcomed the development of gender relations in the United States that granted more independence to them, many German-American men were less enthusiastic about the differences they perceived. In a letter to the women's page, Robert Uhlig from Trinidad, Colorado, expressed his irritation about a certain weakening of traditional gender arrangements in the United States that obviously gave more independence and leeway to women than he was prepared to accept. He contrasted the sensible German wife with the unruly and unreasonable American woman:

American women yell a lot, while German women are quiet and do their work; it is clear that our German comrades know what they want and cannot learn anything from our suffragists. . . . In the United States, women didn't even fight for the suffrage. Rather, the men gave it to them, because they hoped that then more women would settle in the states in question. . . . And this suffrage movement has had such great effect that today there is hardly any opposition to it. American men and women are the most stupid, for it is here that prostitution has spread more than anywhere else. Nowhere have I seen so many unmarried women, even though there is a surplus of men.³⁰

Uhlig's views did not go unchallenged. The editors of the women's page commented on his letter tersely and ironically, contending that "our correspondent's lack of information is remarkable. The granting of the suffrage in Colorado was preceded by a tremendous agitation campaign. The Suffrage Association there was one of the strongest."³¹ The editorial staff was increasingly tired of having to deal with certain male arguments. These women had immersed themselves in socialist theory and they were familiar with both anarchist thought and the feminist ideas of the American women's movement. In addition, they could draw on their own experiences as women in a male-dominated movement.³²

German-American feminists' knowledge and ability to reflect profitably on their own situation stood in stark contrast to their lack of power. At a time when they had discussed and analyzed woman's situation among themselves, they had to deal with self-confident men whose intellectual prowess may have been weaker but who could enforce their will on the level of the debate. When answering a male

reader who had insisted on the naturalness of conventional gender arrangements, the editors of the women's page called his ideas "weird opinions," pointing out that they were "terribly tired, after having refuted the same ancient arguments a thousand times, to have to refute them 1001 times, particularly for someone who claims to be a socialist." Resignedly, they recommended that he "diligently read the women's page and study Bebel's book *Woman and Socialism*." ³³

Until 1908 the suffrage movement was mentioned time and again on the women's page. Female suffrage was a long-standing demand of the Social Democrats and part of their platform in Germany. In October 1901 the Social Democratic Women's Association of New York had passed a resolution demanding the suffrage for women. ³⁴ In 1903 the central committee of the Social Democratic Women's Association decided "to start an energetic agitation for women's suffrage." ³⁵ But although the demand for women's suffrage was never questioned, it was not considered to be of outstanding importance. This was reflected in attitudes toward suffrage among the rank and file as well as in the various socialist organizations. Female functionaries and agitators alike complained of working women's indifference toward suffrage and politics in general, but also of the remarkable lack of willingness on the part of the men to allow women to participate in political life. ³⁶ Further, the party did not even attach much importance to any agitation among women.

This situation changed dramatically around 1908, when the American suffrage movement gained impetus and when it was successful in attracting the interest of working women to a larger extent than did the socialist movement itself. As a consequence, the years before World War I saw suffrage emerge as a major political issue in the socialist movement. What has been noted for American socialist women was true for German-Americans, too: "Only when the suffrage movement threatened to entice females away from the party, and pit the wives of socialists against their husbands," did a greater interest in agitating among women develop. ³⁷ The women's page pleaded, "We have to reach the masses of working women whom we tend to lose to the suffrage movement. The women's movement must be taken seriously." ³⁸

From 1908 on, the suffrage question became the most important single issue discussed on the women's page. The suffrage movements of all foreign countries and American states were covered extensively and approvingly. Suffrage, however, carried in its wake other, no less important, problems for the socialist movement. On the one hand, it was closely connected with general theoretical judgment of the bourgeois women's movement and the tactical question of how socialists

should behave toward it. On the other hand, it was tied up with the long-neglected question of suffrage agitation among working women.

German-American socialists were stirred by these developments. First, there was the danger of losing working women to the suffrage movement. Moreover, as more states granted suffrage, it became clear that universal suffrage was about to come and that working women would be potential voters. By 1913, suffrage was no longer a side-show for socialists. Instead, party activists felt that one of the "most urgent tasks of socialist agitation" was to drive home to proletarian women the outstanding importance of female suffrage for the socialist cause. "Now it was held that proletarian women must not be taken by surprise by the new rights and duties which the conquest of female suffrage bestows upon them. . . . They must be educated to realize the full importance of this weapon, which suffrage puts in their hands."³⁹ Only when suffrage seemed close at hand did the party ascribe so much importance to women.

One way of trying to make working women stick to the cause was the attempt to enforce party discipline. In 1910, after lengthy discussions had been carried on in the women's page, an "open letter to a young socialist" was published. A young German woman had inquired if membership in the Suffrage Association was compatible with membership in the Socialist party. This young socialist explained that she had arrived at the conviction that the woman question was the most compelling issue of the present time. The women's page answered with an open letter because, as they claimed, "this is not a personal matter: Lately many socialist women have grappled with this problem and thus a public discussion is desirable." The answer was that participation in the suffrage movement was superfluous for a socialist woman, because the Socialist party was itself the largest pro-suffrage party. The young woman was asked to reserve all her energy for socialist agitation, because her special interest in the woman question obliged her to dedicate herself to the socialist movement and to work for women's suffrage as a socialist.⁴⁰

Socialist women, however, did not seem to be very impressed by attempts to discredit the suffrage movement and to lure them away from it. Party discipline on the woman question failed to hold German-American women.⁴¹ Within the editorial staff of the women's page, both theoretical positions—one propagating the "correct," i.e., orthodox socialist view of the woman question, the other pleading for cooperation with bourgeois women—coexisted. Whereas agreement grew within the socialist movement that increased agitational efforts were necessary so that the socialist movement would not be damaged

considerably by the exodus of working-class women, the editorial staff of the women's page remained split over questions of strategy and tactics in dealing with the women's movement.

The faction of feminist socialists gained ground, however. An article published in 1909 brushed away "the old saw according to which the woman question could be solved together with the social question"⁴² and asserted that until a short time ago, the Socialist party had not even displayed any serious interest in women's suffrage and women's political emancipation. Another article lavished praise on the women of the *American Suffragette* (which spoke for the radical wing of the suffragists) and cheered the American tour of suffragists Emmeline Pankhurst and Dora Montefiori, describing them as "two gorgeous women."⁴³ Teresa Malkiel, garment worker, socialist organizer, and columnist of the women's page, commented that "socialist women, too, are full of admiration for Pankhurst. However, they do not forget that she completely neglects the economic slavery of both men and women."⁴⁴

Opinions expressing overt sympathy or solidarity with the women's movement were anything but the exception on the women's page; one unsigned article (probably written by Meta Stern) claimed that the position held by the SPD in Germany should not be adopted because "in the United States there is actually only *one* women's movement. . . . In the United States things are different from England, different from Germany, probably different from any other European country. First of all, here no strict demarcations can be drawn between a bourgeois and a proletarian women's movement. In its beginnings, the American women's movement was completely bourgeois: But during the last couple of years it has had great success among working women and this is the very reason why it has grown so strong. Many working women support the women's movement."⁴⁵

Even Auguste Lilienthal, by that time over seventy, interjected a furious letter into the discussion, calling socialists who opposed cooperation with bourgeois women "old, fossilized and orthodox." She ridiculed the idea of "pure and undiluted socialism"—while at the same time emphasizing her devotion to the socialist idea.⁴⁶ This letter provoked letters by other women who emphatically agreed with her. One of them, Frances Schmeling, wrote: "I am a socialist and I will remain one. But I will fight for women's suffrage till my last drop of blood. I think we should not build a Chinese Wall around us, but fight along with all women all over the world for our political liberties, because only united will we win."⁴⁷

The overwhelming majority of socialist women on the editorial staff

as well as among the rank and file shared this opposition to strict separation from bourgeois women. They thought that it was their duty "to work for the achievement of female suffrage and to work hand in hand with the women of other classes for at least part of the day."⁴⁸ This faction characteristically was represented by women who spoke English and who had connections with English-speaking socialists and feminists. But for the socialist hard-liners any cooperation with bourgeois women was a major ideological mistake. This faction was headed by Greie-Cramer, Charlotte Schneppe, and Dr. Anna Ingermann. Julie Romm, who became editor of the women's page in 1911, also seems to have been closer to this group than to the feminist sympathizers even though her position was not as defined as that of the others.⁴⁹ Ludwig Lore, a central figure in this camp, was a German socialist who had immigrated in 1905 and later became editor of the *NYVZ*.⁵⁰ Between 1905 and the beginning of World War I, Lore made himself a specialist on the woman question among German-American socialists. He agitated untiringly in the German-American women's branches of the New York area, where he made speeches on various issues.

The faction centered on Greie-Cramer and Lore vehemently opposed the idea of an autonomous feminist cause and publicly disapproved of the position of the National Women's Committee.⁵¹ In their opinion "these women do not want to and cannot understand that we have to make a precise and clean class division. . . . Among the comrades who are in the foreground now, because they speak English and because the movement must and is supposed to be 'English' the strangest opinions are rampant. In any case, they do not sufficiently emphasize the class struggle."⁵² This view found fewer and fewer followers among the rank and file; columnists and readers alike increasingly found it absurd and saw advantages in working together with bourgeois suffragists. "Comrade Lore always has letters at hand which he cites," a "socialist woman" wrote to the page. "He claims that it was a woman who wrote him insisting that we should only work with the Party. Well, but if the Party does not do anything? Should we then just sit down and wait? . . . Here, we do not yet have a proletarian women's movement. . . . We should not be so fanatical but instead follow up good developments wherever they occur. Sisters, seize any opportunity to agitate, also among bourgeois women."⁵³

During a conference called by the Women's Committee of Local New York, Lore himself saw no problem in agreeing with a bourgeois man.⁵⁴ Four men—Morris Hillquit, Algernon Lee, Ludwig Lore, and Robert Bruere, debated the merits of socialist suffrage clubs. Hillquit and Lee were in favor of them, but Lore sided with upper-class urban

reformer and union supporter Robert Bruere—after having put much effort into convincing socialist women that any kind of cooperation with bourgeois women was harmful to the movement.⁵⁵ It is interesting to note that this kind of public behavior by a socialist man did not require any explanation.

Bourgeois women, meanwhile, worked toward an accommodation with socialist women and made use of the socialist press. When the National-American Woman Suffrage Association (NAWSA) sent a message to the convention of the Socialist Women's Society, it was published on the women's page.⁵⁶ In a letter signed by Dr. Anna Howard Shaw, president of NAWSA, Ella Hawley Crossett, president of the New York State Suffrage Association, and Ida Husted Harper, chairwoman of the National Press Committee of NAWSA, the suffragists congratulated socialist women on the platform of the Socialist party and asked for their cooperation in the great movement that was underway.⁵⁷

The cooperation between socialist and suffragist women reached a peak in 1909 during the shirtwaist-makers' strike in New York. Suffragists concerned with the condition of working women joined the Women's Trade Union League and helped organize the strike. The shops went on strike in September 1909 and strikers were supported with money and publicity by bourgeois women. During a meeting called by Alva Smith Belmont, Mary Averell Harriman, and Anne Morgan at the Colony Club, strikers presented their case. Mrs. Belmont and Anna Howard Shaw spoke at a huge rally in New York's Hippodrome, for which Mrs. Belmont paid the bill.⁵⁸ Ironically, however, the women's page did not mention the involvement of bourgeois women in the strike. Almost a year passed before the women's page referred to the shirtwaist-makers' strike again, remarking that during a conference in the Labor Temple, socialist women had voted overwhelmingly against cooperation with bourgeois women. "However," the women's page continued, "a couple of days after the stormy conference socialist women organized a huge rally for the striking shirtwaist-makers together with bourgeois women of all shades. Two months later, socialist women invited all of the bourgeois suffrage associations of New York to their great suffrage demonstration in Carnegie Hall. . . . A couple of months later, bourgeois suffragists held a rally in Union Square and invited all socialist women. They accepted the invitation and participated with their banner and a socialist woman presented a socialist speech from the platform of a bourgeois women's association." ⁵⁹

German-American socialists got increasingly worried about losing

working women to the feminist cause. In the winter of 1910 the German Agitation Committee for Women was reorganized and started holding rallies aimed at agitating and organizing working women. Also in 1910 the women's page started a campaign addressed to the readers. It ran under the heading, "How can we reach working-class women?" and invited suggestions and new ideas for agitation among German-American working-class women. One explicit aim was to reach married women, who were considered to be completely submerged in home and family. "Occupied with the eternal sorrows and strife," the women's page proclaimed, "the homemaker's intellect withers away completely."⁶⁰ A couple of months before, this very discussion had taken place in the "Löwenrachen." Now an agitation campaign was started in the socialist press; pamphlets addressed to women were published in all socialist papers. The first one, which appeared on the women's page of the NYVZ in January 1911, was written by Teresa Malkiel and entitled "To the Working Woman."⁶¹ This article appealed to the working woman exclusively as a class subject and did not have any feminist implications.

Readers also participated actively in the discussion of how to reach working women. German-American women tried to give advice on how to deal with female political apathy in letters to the women's page. Suggestions included the increased distribution of leaflets, visiting housewives at home, talking to them as woman to woman, and demanding that at least every fortnight meetings should be called exclusively for women and girls.⁶² Some letters pointed out that the special situation of women in a class-based and sexist society made smooth and easy alliances impossible. In the opinion of one correspondent, the greatest hindrance for women to take part in political life was the socialist husband. She observed that even though socialist men were prepared to go to extremes to defend their own rights, they saw women primarily as housewives and as mothers of small children. She concluded, "My opinion is: Women have to defend their rights on their own and have to fight. They, too, have to go to the extreme to find out the truth."⁶³ Another reader agreed that men did not really want women as fighting comrades in the movement, not least, she claimed, because then it would become more difficult for men "to enrich their knowledge in the tavern with a couple of drinks."⁶⁴ The fact that often socialist men were almost hostile to the women's cause was also revealed by a report of a socialist woman on a German local's meeting when a petition on suffrage was discussed. Rejecting a plea addressed to the men to help in distributing the petition, one comrade got up asking "whether or not we are in a local of the Socialist party here or in

a philanthropic association supporting the weak and helpless."⁶⁵ The women's page cited this kind of behavior as another bad example of the conduct of male comrades and pleaded for a more unified class consciousness.

Given these conditions, the discussion on how to reach the working woman proved difficult. It was continued on the women's page for about two years until 1913. Finally it was openly acknowledged that it had become necessary for the party to offer something to socialist women activists, for the women's movement had become more and more attractive. The socialist movement had to address the question of its relationship to the suffrage movement more seriously and thoroughly. One obstacle in women's agitation, the women's page claimed, was "our indefinite, insecure, and inconsistent attitude toward other, nonsocialist women's organizations." "The lack of unity, the inconsistency and indifference within the party itself regarding women's agitation" was deplored.⁶⁶ Socialist women increasingly solved the problem on their own, without recourse to the party's stance. They held offices in the Socialist party while at the same time being active in the suffrage movement side by side with bourgeois women. They also supported the Women's Trade Union League. Still, the women's page admitted, these women were as good comrades as any.

These developments also influenced relations between German and American socialists and created conflict between German-American and English-speaking sections on questions of suffrage and women's agitation. In this conflict, starting around 1911, the women's page retreated from its one-time independent and defiant position back to a more orthodox one. To be sure, the women's page still published articles advocating feminist positions. One example is the lengthy contribution by Esther Sinovieva-Deutsch in 1913 entitled "Women's Clubs and Professional Associations," which militantly and intelligently advocated an autonomous women's struggle.⁶⁷ Also, they reported on the activities and standpoint of both the German sections and the English-speaking ones. However, the editorial staff now seemed to avoid open discussion and seemed to favor the orthodox stance.

Tensions peaked when no consensus could be reached on the participation of German speakers during "Woman's Day" in February 1912. The official explanation for not accepting German-American speakers was that they would not be understood by everyone. As a consequence, German-American women held their own rally. The women's page claimed that there was absolutely no reason to have so many English-speaking contributors, and that the Socialist Women's

Committee had made a tremendous mistake and weakened the movement by excluding German-American speakers. Nevertheless, until World War I, Woman's Day was never again a joint project. The English-speaking branches held their Woman's Day; a bloc composed of German, Bohemian, and Hungarian women rallied separately. The women's page editors deemed this development "unfortunate" but finally allowed that even though the branches did not march together, they intended to strike together.⁶⁸

Dissent on theoretical positions had its effect on all levels of socialist organization. English and German women's agitation committees split their activities, and German-American women now generally cooperated with Bohemian and Hungarian branches. The German Women's Agitation Committee was eager to point out that they did not have any connections to the Women's Agitation Committee of Local New York, and that they concentrated on German women exclusively.⁶⁹ Whereas the National Women's Committee was now in turn accused by the NYVZ of displaying insufficient tolerance toward other language branches, there were countercharges that German-American women's branches were not open enough toward other positions.⁷⁰ Thus, the gap on the woman question between German-American and other American socialists widened. German-American women who had tried to unify socialist and feminist positions tended to drift into English-speaking groups. In early 1913 Meta Stern, at one time chief editor of the woman's page, became secretary of the English-speaking Women's Committee of Local New York.⁷¹ Teresa Malkiel, too, seems to have contributed more now to the *Call* than to the NYVZ, and when the women's page took over one of Malkiel's articles from the *Call* in 1914, it did so commenting that the editors did not "quite agree with Malkiel's conclusions"⁷² that women were better socialists than men. Malkiel had contended that in the socialist movement for women, history repeated itself: "As long as agitation was exclusively up to the men, we constantly had to fight a deficit. . . . But not now, since women have taken over. . . . They first and foremost think of the work that has to be done. . . . Recently they have been called the live wires of the movement and this is what they are."⁷³

The women's page of the NYVZ did not systematically pursue the discussion of theoretical differences over the woman question. To be sure, time and again articles were printed advocating a socialist-feminist position. However, the accompanying comments always included a rejection of that position. Even though the problem could not be ignored altogether, it became clear that within the editorial staff a more orthodox line had won out again. So, the debate on how to

reach working women was carried on without explicit reference to the problems emphasized by feminist-oriented women. As Greie-Cramer had done before,⁷⁴ the staff now pursued a policy sympathetic to the behavior of male socialists. To be sure, there were men whose conduct toward women was questionable, the argument went, but one should not forget that men were in a quandary, too. One columnist pointed out that sometimes socialist men would like to act differently but could not do so due to external coercion. Coercion was defined as the production process on the one hand and gender traditions, which supposedly weighed heavily on men, on the other. The question of power relations between men and women was simply not posed in this argument. Instead, men were portrayed as the helpless victims of a tradition that accidentally ascribed a privileged position to them. Women's double work burden was not discussed. The possibility for change was projected into the future; as time went on, it was hoped, things would gradually change and equality would come.⁷⁵

Action was again called for when woman suffrage for the state of New York was imminent. By 1913 nine states had incorporated suffrage into their constitutions. For the *NYVZ* this was reason enough to dedicate an entire extra page to the question of how the socialist movement should react. It would be "depressing and humiliating" if suffrage were granted in New York and socialist women behaved indifferently.⁷⁶ Suffrage was primarily welcomed because it was deemed to be a decisive instrument in the class struggle. Therefore, the *NYVZ* could without ideological problems support a rally of all socialist women in Greater New York presided over by Teresa Malkiel. It was held at the Labor Temple in March 1913, primarily for preparing foreign-born women for their naturalization. There was consensus that as many foreign working-class women as possible should be reached to ensure their participation in the next elections. In view of the overall importance of this issue for the socialist movement, men were also called on to participate. The naturalization campaign was supported by all branches and filled the women's pages of the *NYVZ*. In 1914, Malkiel, in addition to her other tasks, started to work as an unpaid agitator for women's suffrage⁷⁷ and soon an agitation committee was formed consisting of Rose Schneidermann, Anna Ingermann, Meta Stern, Pauline Newman, and others to raise money for another socialist suffrage campaign.⁷⁸

By now, however, World War I had started and even though suffrage was still an important topic on the women's page, events in Europe increasingly preoccupied German-American socialists. For many German-Americans, men as well as women, who still had rela-

tives and friends in the German Reich, political developments in their new home became secondary to the war in the old country. "The European war has thrown a burning flame into our ranks," the women's page stated, "and has temporarily paralyzed our interest in the suffrage question."⁷⁹ As distinct from the "Löwenrachen," the women's page refrained from any overt political comments. Whereas the "Löwenrachen" vehemently opposed support for war credits on the part of the Majority Socialists in Germany, the women's page primarily dealt with the plight of the civilian population and the human consequences of the war. It also reflected on the emotional importance of European developments for German-Americans. "The best we have to offer, especially our materialist philosophy, developed on German soil," the women's page wrote, "now, all of a sudden, all connections are temporarily cut. . . . We are groping about in the dark, seizing any bit of unproven news."⁸⁰

The women's page adopted a pacifist-feminist standpoint. In discussing radical German feminists and leftists Anita Augspurg and Lida Heymann as well as American pacifists Ellen Key and Carrie Chapman-Catt, it pointed out that bourgeois women, too, worked for international solidarity and passionately condemned the war.⁸¹ An article by Meta Stern called "Fight the War" summed up this position, claiming that the women of this world were no enemies to each other and that all women had a historical mission to complete, which would bring about a world without wars.⁸² German-American socialists continued to conduct suffrage agitation and rallies, but when suffrage finally was granted in the state of New York, for German-American socialists it was overshadowed by the World War, which for them posed a major political and emotional problem.

NOTES

1. Annik Mahaim, Alix Holt, and Jacqueline Heinen, *Frauen und Arbeiterbewegung*, p. 66.

2. In 1914 Teresa Malkiel in a letter to socialist women's groups of New York pointed out the necessity to reserve a page for women in their newspapers. The Finnish women responded that they did not consider a women's page necessary, since they had been working together with men in locals for some period of time. NYVZ, May 9, 1915.

3. See, e.g., NYVZ, Mar. 15, 1903, when it was also stated that "in the working class's great struggle for emancipation, one can by no means do without the active participation of women."

4. Richard Evans points out that Social Democracy changed from a workers' movement to a family movement, making it necessary to extend social demo-

cratic thought from men to all members of the family (*Sozialdemokratie und Frauenemanzipation*, p. 235).

5. Catherine Clinton, *Other Civil War*, p. 189.

6. NYVZ, Jan. 21, Mar. 16, 1902.

7. NYVZ, Mar. 16, 1902.

8. For the various feminist positions of the time see June Sochen, *Movers and Shakers*, pp. 31–95.

9. Jean Quataert, "German Socialist Women's Movement," pp. 286f.

10. As late as 1920, Henriette Fürth confirmed in the *Gleichheit* that sexual behavior was "the most private affair of any person," thus banning sexuality from the realm of politics (30, July 17, 1920).

11. Meta Stern is also known as Meta Lilienthal. *Gleichheit*, 7, 1910, p. 111.

12. For example, NYVZ, May 3, 1905.

13. The term "discourse" is here meant in the Foucauldian sense, a "policy of speech" that selects what is or is not talked about in a given culture. Foucault assumes that power produces discourses and that there is no knowledge that is not constituted within power relations. See Jeffrey Weeks, "Foucault for Historians," p. 111.

14. NYVZ, Sept. 16, 1900.

15. See the portrait of Sybille Hess, wife of Moses Hess, in NYVZ, Feb. 28, 1904.

16. NYVZ, Oct. 7, 1906.

17. On a reduced scale, these contradictions also occupied the German Socialists. Here, a position won out that has been called the "inner conservatism of socialist emancipation theory," meaning the acceptance of bourgeois family ideology and the associated ideal of woman. The idealization of petit bourgeois family life was also characteristic for leading socialist women in Germany. See Birgit Koehn, Helga Milz, et al., "Verlässliche Frauenspersonen und Luxusdamen," pp. 160–202. Jean Quataert also points out the "delicacy" with which female leaders in Germany approached family life and the apparent fear to tackle that topic (*Reluctant Feminists*), p. 158.

18. Ruth Seifert, "Portrayal of Women in the German-American Labor Movement."

19. Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, *Disorderly Conduct*, p. 176.

20. Atina Grossmann, *New Woman*. See also Manes Sperber, *Vergebliche Warnung*, p. 213.

21. This was quite similar to the situation of social democratic women in Germany. Jean Quataert points out that antifeminism in the rank and file and by party functionaries was often deplored by socialist women, since "traditional ideals partially frustrated socialist women's efforts to create a new consciousness of the equal worth of males and females." This was, however, not seriously tackled "until the post-World War I period and later." Only then "did socialist women clearly recognize and lament this gap." Quataert, "German Socialist Women's Movement," pp. 419, 417.

22. When discussing Bebel's merits in respect to the so-called woman ques-

tion, it should be noted that more recent interpretations suggest that Bebel's "Woman" was primarily an attempt to establish male hegemony in an unstable proletarian context, where the discourses on women of the bourgeois culture had become dysfunctional. See Roswitha Burgard and Gaby Carsten, *Die Märchenonkel der Frauenfrage*, and Ruth Seifert, "Bebel Revisited."

23. Mary P. Ryan, *Womanhood in America*, p. 169.

24. Priscilla Robertson, *Experience of Women*, p. 200.

25. *Chicagoer Arbeiterzeitung*, Sept. 9, 1895.

26. *Chicagoer Arbeiterzeitung*, Sept. 9, 1895.

27. *Chicagoer Arbeiterzeitung*, Mar. 8, 1896.

28. In Germany, the Social Democrat Edmund Fischer as late as 1905 had advocated a "wife-mother-housekeeper" model in a socialist framework that was not fundamentally challenged by socialist women, who, on the whole, "concentrated on the goal of furthering the revolution and promoting class consciousness; they devoted less attention to questions of love, marriage and family relation." See Quartaert, *Reluctant Feminists*, pp. 100f.

29. NYVZ, Nov. 22, 1908.

30. NYVZ, May 2, 1909.

31. NYVZ, May 2, 1909.

32. See, for a similar example among Jewish women, Maxine S. Seller, "Defining Socialist Womanhood," p. 418.

33. NYVZ, Jan. 10, 1909.

34. NYVZ, Oct. 20, 1901.

35. NYVZ, Feb. 1, 1903.

36. For socialist men's attitudes see Ruth Seifert, "Portrayal of Women in the German-American Labor Movement."

37. Ryan, *Womanhood in America*, p. 196.

38. NYVZ, Nov. 20, 1910.

39. NYVZ, Feb. 16, 1913.

40. NYVZ, Oct. 30, 1910.

41. In Germany, the situation was different. In 1908, legal restrictions on female organization were revoked. The possibility of joining the party, however, was not without its liabilities, because now women's activities were restricted by party directives. In Germany, even though women grumbled, on the whole, they stuck to the party line. See Quartaert, *Reluctant Feminists*, p. 148.

42. NYVZ, Apr. 18, 1909.

43. NYVZ, Aug. 15, 1909.

44. NYVZ, Sept. 26, 1909, and Oct. 31, 1909. Teresa Malkiel had contributed to the women's page of the NYVZ for a couple of years before she entered the editorial staff in 1910.

45. NYVZ, Nov. 28, 1909.

46. NYVZ, Dec. 5, 1909.

47. NYVZ, Dec. 12, 1909.

48. NYVZ, Mar. 14, 1909.

49. In October 1911 she took a stand against Lore claiming that no such sharp demarcation should be drawn between women's economic and political struggles. See NYVZ, Oct. 29, 1911.

50. In the spring of 1911, Ludwig Lore and his wife Lilly became editors of the *Little Socialist Magazine*. See NYVZ, Apr. 16, 1911.

51. Greie-Cramer and Ludwig Lore in NYVZ, Apr. 18, 25, 1909. See, for example, Aug. 1, 1909, when the women's page comments on a speech which Lore gave in Branch 5 entitled "Women and Prohibition": "Comrade Lore does not consider this topic interesting, but talked about it nevertheless. From the socialist point of view, there is no men's or women's position, only a class position."

52. NYVZ, Apr. 18, 1909.

53. NYVZ, Apr. 11, 1909.

54. NYVZ, May 7, 1911.

55. NYVZ, May 7, 1911. A couple of months later it turned out that the debates on socialist suffrage clubs were superfluous since working women were not attracted by them. NYVZ, Aug. 20, 1911. Regarding Robert Bruere see Melvyn Dubofsky, *When Workers Organize*, p. 25.

56. The Socialist Women's Society was a cross-ethnic association with primarily educational objectives. It was independent of the Socialist party; however, many members were party members as well. NYVZ, June 6, 1909; NYVZ, Oct. 24, 1909.

57. Christine A. Lunardini, *From Equal Suffrage to Equal Rights*, p. 23.

58. Eleanor Flexner, *Century of Struggle*, p. 242.

59. NYVZ, Oct. 2, 1910. Dubofsky has pointed out that Theodore Roosevelt, too, took the opportunity to sound "the trumpet for yet another moral crusade" by demanding better living conditions for these "future mothers" (*When Workers Organize*, p. 83).

60. NYVZ, Dec. 4, 1910.

61. NYVZ, Jan. 11, 1911.

62. This was a demand raised in a letter by Elizabeth Paul of Evergreen, Long Island, who called herself "an older woman." NYVZ, Feb. 4, 1912.

63. NYVZ, Jan. 1, 1911.

64. NYVZ, May 7, 1911.

65. NYVZ, Nov. 5, 1911.

66. NYVZ, Apr. 29, 1911.

67. Sinovieva-Deutsch published a series of articles in the NYVZ, Feb. 23, Mar. 16, Apr. 6, 1913.

68. NYVZ, Mar. 3, 1912, Feb. 22, 1914.

69. NYVZ, Jan. 1912.

70. NYVZ, Nov. 26, 1911, and Mar. 24, 1912.

71. NYVZ, Apr. 20, 1913.

72. NYVZ, June 21, 1914.

73. NYVZ, June 21, 1914.

74. See Greie-Cramer in the NYVZ on Apr. 6, 1902.

75. NYVZ, Apr. 13, 1913.
76. NYVZ, Feb. 16, 1913.
77. NYVZ, Jan. 17, 1915.
78. NYVZ, Dec. 19, 1914.
79. NYVZ, Mar. 21, 1915.
80. NYVZ, Aug. 13, 1914.
81. NYVZ, Feb. 21, 1915.
82. NYVZ, Aug. 13, 1914.